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Jauss asserts that a new literary work “does not present itself as something absolutely new in an informational vacuum, but predisposes its audience to a very specific kind of reception by announcements, overt and covert signals, familiar characteristics, or implicit allusions” (1982: 79).

It must be stated at once, however, that, in *kakawin* literature, although genealogy was made use of as in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, the connection of Javanese kingship and Indian heroes was not yet evident.

It may be useful to note that even in the late fifteenth century Tanakung could write the *Wṛttasaṅcaya*, which is regarded as “a textbook on poetics which must have been based on first-hand knowledge of Indian sources” (Teeuw et al. 1969: 19).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>gadung</td>
<td>gaďuũg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pandan</td>
<td>pāndan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dusun</td>
<td>Ɂusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marmanatī</td>
<td>Marmawatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>handuru</td>
<td>hańɖuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>gading</td>
<td>gading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>gadung</td>
<td>gaďuũg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>dusun</td>
<td>ḍusun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>recount</td>
<td>recount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>an descendant</td>
<td>a descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>13–14</td>
<td>in compatible with</td>
<td>incompatible in many respects with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>in chapter two, there are several points in chapter two, there are...</td>
<td>in chapter two, there are...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>heros</td>
<td>heroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>n.3</td>
<td>(a25)</td>
<td>(a25) (Kats 1910: 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>n.3</td>
<td>(a27)</td>
<td>(a27) (Kats 1910: 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>position.</td>
<td>position. (1983: 81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>the horizon</td>
<td>a new horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heine-Gerdern</td>
<td>Heine-Geldern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>a ascetic</td>
<td>an ascetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>n.39</td>
<td>Arjunawijaya (2.8)</td>
<td>Arjunawijaya (3.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary

The Sutasmaka kawin is an Old-Javanese narrative poem composed by the Majapahit court poet mpu Tantular in the fourteenth century. The kakawin narrative is one of the most intriguing ones; it recounts the deeds of the prince Sutasoma, who is born as the incarnation of the Supreme Buddha Wairocana in India in the kali age in order to restore social and cosmic order. The object of the present study is to investigate the reception of the work by ancient Javanese society, drawing on analytical tools from literary theory, in particular Jauss’s concept of the “horizon of expectation”, which enables us to situate the work in its socio-historical context.

As a preliminary, in chapter two, literary functions of kakawin narratives, that is, narration, forms of representation, unities of the represented and social function, are examined in terms of Jauss’s genre theory. This clarifies the “epic-ness” of kakawin literature in contrast to kidung literature. At the end of the chapter, the past studies of kakawin literature is reviewed in the light of Jauss’s theoretical framework in order to assess what has been known about the literature.

In chapter three we turn to the unities of the representation of the Sutasmaka narrative, focusing our attention on its spatial and temporal settings. The analysis points to a tension in the narrative between the force of “localization”, a process which by various narratological means brings the represented world closer to the world where the audience lives, and the force of “epic-ness”, a feature which is inherent in kakawin genre and which causes the represented world to distance itself from the audience. In this regard it is suggested that the Sutasmaka kakawin has a transitionary character between kakawin and kidung literature.

The following chapters concern two important aspects of the social function of the Sutasmaka narrative; religious and political aspects. Firstly, chapter four deals with the religious aspect. The comparison with the Indian jātaka stories and the life story of the Buddha reveals that although there is substantial influence from these Indian Buddhist stories on the Sutasmaka narrative, its theme is unprecedented in the previous texts. The analysis of Sutasmaka’s journey to Mount Meru indicates that there is a correspondence between the hero’s movement in the narrative and his spiritual progress in terms of Tantric Buddhism. The progress culminates when the hero enters the two maṇḍala configurations symbolically embedded in the narrative, in which he
achieves the ultimate goal of the journey, the realization of his true identity. At the end of the chapter it is argued that Tantric Buddhism enables the hero to become what may be termed as "Buddha-King", the one who has become the Buddha and the Universal Monarch at the same time. Despite statements in the narrative of the oneness of the truth of the Buddha and that of Śiwa, it is shown that the story clearly demonstrates the Buddha-King's superiority over kṣatriya kings as well as the god Śiwa in maintaining social and cosmic order.

The political aspect, finally, is discussed in chapter five. After analyzing the function of the female royal consort in literature and society, we examine the mode of obtaining the consort, that is, kin relationship and marriage practices, in the Sutasoma and other literary narratives. In the Sutasoma, as in the Mahābhārata cycle, kingship is transferred along a patrilineal lineage, whereas a male person marries his mother's brother's daughter (matrilateral cross-cousin). The latter practice consolidates the relationship between patrilineal lineages. In Tantular's previous work Arjunawijaya, however, what is emphasized is not a particular pattern of marriage practice but the endorsement of kingship by the priesthood. It is then suggested that this thematic shift from the Arjunawijaya to the Sutasoma narrative reflects the change of the socio-historical situation. The Arjunawijaya may have been Tantular's comment on the militaristic period of Gajah Mada, in which the interest of the priesthood was neglected. On the other hand, the Sutasoma, which argues for a peaceful solution of a conflict and the consolidation of kin relationship through cousin marriage, may have been regarded by the reader as Tantular's comment on the political tension between the eastern and western palaces of Majapahit kingdom which led to the civil war of 1406.
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A few words are called for here on the spelling convention used in this thesis. The convention is generally based on the one employed in Zoetmulder (1982) except for “j”, which is spelt as “ng” in this thesis. To be consistent, this convention is also applied to Sanskrit words which are also used in Old Javanese texts. Thus “Wairocana”, not “Vairocana”, and “bajra”, not “vajra”. However, when the title of a Sanskrit text is mentioned, I keep the original spelling, for instance “Bhaṭṭikāvya”.

In
a part of chapter five, in which I discuss the Middle Javanese *kidung* Malat, I have followed the convention employed by Vickers (1986). Finally, the plural suffix -s is not used when writing a word in a language other than English. Thus, for instance, not “four yugas” but “four yuga”.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION: HORIZON OF EXPECTATION

Scope and Aims of the Study

"Bhinneka tunggal ika", a national slogan of the Republic of Indonesia, is customarily translated into English as “unity in diversity” referring to “the unity of Indonesia as the nation and its ethnic diversity”. The phrase is taken from the kakawin Sutasoma, composed by the fourteenth century poet mpu Tantular. While the translation and its interpretation are indicative of the perception of the phrase by modern Indonesian society, it is immediately obvious that this interpretation could not be the one imagined by ancient Javanese society in the Majapahit era, about a half millenium before the foundation of the republic. This small instance demonstrates that a text itself is only part of a historical process of literary communication, a process of making sense out of a literary text. Even if the contents of the text were intact, which is in fact more or less true of this particular text largely thanks to Balinese devotion for the meticulous preservation of kakawin texts, the perception of the text by a reading public never ceases to change.

This study aims at understanding what may have been the reception of the work by ancient Javanese society by explicating the complex relationship within and between textual and contextual elements which are distributed in different facets of a literary system of the work to be named “text”, “narrative”, “narration” and “social function”, and thus at unveiling the richness of the work’s textuality. To accomplish this task I have drawn extensively on literary theory which has shown a remarkable development in recent years, providing us with a variety of conceptual tools which are potentially helpful in our understanding of Old Javanese literature. As is clear from the foregoing statement, I found the notion of the reception of the text by the audience, in
particular the one advanced by the German literary theorist Jauss, the most fruitful approach to this problem, for it fits in well with three criteria I believe we can use to judge the appropriateness of literary methods or frameworks we would apply to the process of understanding an individual Old Javanese text and Old Javanese literature in general.\(^1\) Firstly, the method should be inductive. It should allow us to gather data from the existing texts instead of imposing itself on them. It seems that most of problems with regard to defining Old Javanese literature have arisen because we tend to start from defining Old Javanese literature as a whole, often making the mistake of imposing pre-conceived notions of literature, which are often Western, instead of starting from investigating aspects of individual texts and inducing common characteristics among them. Secondly, the method should enable us to see a text holistically. All parts of the text in reality are inter-related and all together constitute a hierarchical whole which is a dynamic system. Thus we should not be satisfied simply to detect a message in a particular part of the text but should recognize the function of the part in the text as a whole. This criterion is applicable to the text’s relationship with other texts, which should be also seen as a holistic literary system. Thirdly, the method should be historical. It should allow us to situate a text in a socially and historically specific context as well as in a literary genre, and should allow us to see the relation between the text, other texts and the context. In this connection, Robson’s assertion that “a literary work is not something floating free in time and space, but

\(^1\) Robson has put forward five steps towards the construction of Old Javanese poetics (Robson 1983: 291–2). They are: 1. arranging texts in a chronological order; 2. describing the development of a genre based on the chronological framework; 3. understanding a “sociology” of the literature, about which he comments that “we have to ask for whom and by whom a work was created before we can answer the question of what it was supposed to achieve”; 4. explaining the nature and function of the kakawin in particular; 5. Giving an adequate account of what makes poetry what it is. His concerns are more about a systematic theory of Old Javanese literature as a whole, whereas mine are more about understanding a particular text. Nevertheless, his suggestions are useful and are incorporated into my account.
rather something created at a particular point of time and in a certain place” is quite pertinent (1983: 291).

**Horizon of Expectation and Kakawin Literature**

Jauss has attempted to relate literature to socio-historical situation by introducing a sophisticated theoretical framework constructed around a concept called “horizon of expectation”. It refers to a specific kind of reception of texts by a reading public. It is not by chance that among theorists of reception, who assign a greater role to the reader in the process of literary communication, Jauss in particular has been involved in the studies of European medieval literature. To reach a text which is separated from us by a great distance of time and place, it is imperative to take into account the socio-historical situation in which the text was produced, circulated and appreciated. The methodological problematic associated with European medieval literature is comparable to that for the study of Old Javanese literature, and suggests the relevance of Jauss’s theoretical framework for the study of the latter. The advantage of the method of historical reception in studying remote texts is described by Jauss as follows:

The method of historical reception is indispensable for the understanding of literature from the distant past. When the author of a work is unknown, his intent undeclared, and his relationship to sources and models only indirectly accessible, the philological question of how the text is “properly”—that is, “from its intention and time”—to be understood can be best answered if one foregrounds it against those works that the author explicitly or implicitly presupposed his contemporary audience to know. (1982: 28)

Jauss asserts that a new literary work “does not present itself as something absolutely new in an informational vacuum, but predisposes its audience to a very specific kind of reception by announcements, overt and covert signals, familiar characteristics, or implicit allusions” (1982: 79). Only with this preconstituted
reception, or the horizon of expectation, is the reader able to make the text intelligible. The horizon "arises for each work in the historical moment of its appearance" from three factors: "the immanent poetics of the genre", "the implicit relationships to familiar works of the literary-historical surroundings", and "the opposition between fiction and reality" (1982: 24). Following this line of thought, the task of literary investigation is to reconstruct the horizon of expectation through the process of posing "questions that the text gave an answer to" and thus of discovering "how the contemporary reader could have viewed and understood the work" (1982: 28).

Genre, the first facet of the horizon, is understood by Structuralists as a set of conventions or codes which govern formal and thematic elements of a group of related texts and in virtue of which the texts become intelligible for the reader. Having taken this Structuralist premise, Jauss goes further by setting genre in historical perspective. As part of the horizon of expectation, "literary genres are to be understood not as genera (classes) in the logical senses, but rather as groups or historical families. As such, they cannot be deduced or defined, but only historically determined, delimited, and described" (1982: 80). In the light of the genre theory, we should see the Sutasoma text not as an absolute verbal object but as exemplary of the kakawin genre. This, then, enables us to avoid a normative concept of genre which imposes a supposedly universal classification on texts, and at the same time the "work-immanent" approach by which a single text is analyzed in isolation.

The conception of genre as a historical system also enables us to understand in the synchronic dimension of the literary system not only how different genres coexist but how they also "form the various functions of a given period's system, to which they connect the individual work" (Jauss 1982: 106). This insight is particularly important in the study of Javanese literature. Vickers (1986: 19) has drawn our attention to a fact which has been often neglected that in this literary system the three indigenous genres, parwa, kakawin, and kidung, coexisted from the pre-Majapahit period onwards (Zoetmulder 1974: 144–5). This means we can describe kakawin
literature as genre only in connection with other genres which coexisted in the horizon of expectation of ancient Javanese society.

In the diachronic dimension of a literary system, on the other hand, the horizon of expectation also mediates changes of genre and their dominance. Jauss asserts that “from a diachronic perspective the historical alternation of the dominating genre manifests itself in the three steps of canonization, automatization, and reshuffling. Successful genres that embody the “high point” of the literature of a period gradually lose their effective power through continual reproduction; they are forced to the periphery by new genres often arising from a “vulgar” stratum if they cannot be reanimated through a restructuring” (1982: 106). This is important to us because the Sutasoma was produced in the fourteenth century, a transitional period in which we witness a decline in dominance of kakawin and the move to centre stage of kidung literature. Although an extensive investigation on the change from the dominance of kakawin to that of kidung is beyond the scope of this study, it may be possible to identify textual relations between the two genres by investigating what kind of change the Sutasoma brought about in the horizon of expectation.

Jauss has also suggested that, if literary genres are understood as historical families, or “series of works that are bound by a structure forming a continuity and that appear historically”, then “the continuity formative of a genre can lie” not only in what is customarily understood as genre but also “in the succession of the works of one author” (Jauss 1982: 80). This formulation leads us to consider the poet Tantular’s two known works Arjunawijaya and Sutasoma as a “literary series” and prompts us to investigate the relationship of the horizons of expectation for the two works, especially on the part of the author, because in this sort of literary series for the author “the next work can solve formal and moral problems left behind by the last work” (Jauss 1982: 32).

The relationship of a text to other texts in general which were known by the reader constitutes what is called intertextuality by Structuralist theorists. The notion of intertextuality is broader than genre in that it designates the relationships of a text not
only to texts from the same genre but also to texts from other genres as well as non-literary texts. The interrogation of intertextuality also must be distinguished from traditional "source criticism" because, while the latter insists upon identifying the sources of textual elements, the former is concerned to explicate relationships between textual elements. Intertextual relations of textual elements involve the process of transformation of these elements. This process, in terms of theme, can be negative (negated or parodied), affirmative (elaborated or extended) or neutral (simply reproduced). In terms of form it can be implicit (subtle allusion or embedded in the textual structure) or explicit (direct citation). It is, thus, possible to re-investigate the intertextual relationship between the Sutasoma and other kakawin texts, texts of parwa and kidung works, as well as non-literary texts. The recognition of the process of transformation may help us to understand more clearly how the text stood in the horizon expectation.

The notion of the intertextual relationship with non-literary texts bring us to the third element of the horizon of expectation, which may be called the functional connection between literature and society. The connection is grounded in the horizon of expectation because of the assumption that "the reader of a new work can perceive it within the narrower horizon of literary expectations, as well as within the wider horizon of experience of life" (Jauss 1982: 24). Classical literary sociology, Marxist theory in particular, has maintained that literature is a representation of socio-historical reality. This is, needless to say, one aspect of the social function of literature, which is

---

2 It must be noted that the distinction between intertextuality and extratextual relationship to social practice is not as obvious as it might be thought, when one approaches remote texts such as kakawin literature. If we find, for example, a reference to the practice of kingship in the Sutasoma analogous to the one described in the Nāgarakrtgāmā, can we say that this is an instance of intertextual reference to the latter text or to the socio-historical reality, supposing the latter text records the social practice? This is why some theorists such as Kristeva include the "non-verbal symbolic system" in the notion of intertextuality (Culler 1981: 105). This position is not far from Foucault’s notion of "discursive formation". Nevertheless I shall maintain the narrower definition of intertextuality excluding extratextual reference in order to clarify a dynamic relationship between literature and society.
usually called referentiality, the function of relating textual units to extratextual objects, events and knowledge in general. In this sense, referentiality is a broader concept than intertextuality. Jauss, however, has drawn attention to the importance of the reversed aspect of the function. He asserts that “the social function of literature manifests itself in its genuine possibility only where the literary experience of the reader enters into the horizon of expectations of his lived praxis, preforms his understanding of the world, and thereby also has an effect on his social behaviour” (1982: 39). At this point it must be emphasized that the theory of reception is not an approach which excludes the author from the consideration of the literary communication. The author would not produce his work without having assumed its reader’s expectations, because the meaning of a work is the answer the work attempts to give to the question posed by the horizon of expectation. The reception of a work, then, is related to the intention of the author, which Becker defines as “the relation of the creator to the content of the text, the medium, and to the hearers or readers” (1979: 212). The concept of social function defined as above, then, enables us to regard certain elements of the Sutasoma text which refer to social practice in the fourteenth Majapahit kingdom, in particular those pertaining to religion and kingship, as the author’s comments on it.

In the following chapters, with the outline drawn above in my mind, I shall explore the possibility of applying Jauss’s and other literary theories to the study of Javanese literature. In chapter two I shall elaborate Jauss’s theory of literary function as well as other literary ideas and their applicability to the study of kakawin literature within the framework of the horizon of expectation. Intertextuality and chronotope will be discussed, drawing on a narratological approach, in this connection. Inevitably not all the literary functions are extensively addressed in my analysis in the following chapters. Nevertheless this may contribute not only to a better understanding of the Sutasoma kakawin but also to the construction of the poetics of kakawin literature, the first steps toward which have already been taken by a number of scholars, such as Zoetmulder (1974) and Robson (1983), who have suggested that a kakawin literature is a coherent literary system. At the end of chapter two I shall review the study of Old
Javanese *kakawin* literature in the light of the horizon of expectation. In chapter three I shall turn to the narratological organization of the work with special emphasis on its spatial and temporal settings. A tension in the Sutasoma narrative caused by the "localization" of the settings and the "epic-ness" of *kakawin* genre will be pointed out. In due course I shall also indicate the transitional character of the Sutasoma *kakawin* and suggest that this is due to the author's response to the emergence of a new horizon of expectation, namely *kidung* literature. The following two chapters will deal with interaction between the text and extratextual phenomena: religion and politics. In chapter four I shall discuss how religious notions are embedded as the hero's trajectory in the narrative and how it was possible within the Javanese horizon of expectations. In chapter five, some aspects of the kingship of Majapahit kingdom, in particular the one pertaining to kinship, will be dealt with. Again our focus will be not on kingship as such but on how these aspects could be significantly read in the narrative by the Javanese society in relation with the horizon of expectation.
CHAPTER TWO
KAKAWIN LITERATURE AND LITERARY THEORY

Literary Functions

It has been made clear in the previous chapter that in order to analyze a text in terms of the “horizon of expectation” the text must be first situated in the multi-layered network of literary genre, intertextuality, and the social context of a certain historical situation. To facilitate this endeavour, Jauss has developed a concrete model which describes “the literary system of a definite historical situation”. This system is also “a partial system of generic function”. According to Jauss, what “constitutes a literary genre in its unique structure or ‘family similarity’ manifests itself at first in an ensemble of formal as well as thematic characteristics”. Therefore, these formal and thematic characteristics “must first be investigated in their function in a ruled coherence, before their dominant, which shapes a system, can be recognized, and thereby the delimitation from other genres can be decided” (Jauss 1982: 82).

Because Jauss formulates his model in order to describe the medieval genres of epic, romance and novella, there are inevitably some instances where the model does not fit with the details of the Javanese situation. This has led me to make several modifications to the arrangement of the original model, although its basic framework is preserved. It must be also made clear at this point that our intention is of course not to impose any one of the genres in Jauss’s model on any particular genre in ancient Javanese literature but to use them as a convenient reference point. Nevertheless the similar need to access distant texts in a pre-industrial society accounts for a great deal
of the relevance of the model for the study of ancient Javanese literature. With modifications, the model will allow us to locate the Sutasoma, as an exemplary text, in the *kakawin* genre, in the system of Old Javanese literature as well as in the context of ancient Javanese society. In this enterprise we should be able to make the model serve as a framework in relation to which the works of other literary theorists can be evaluated and according to which this thesis will be organized. Our attempt is necessarily a working hypothesis, and our text Sutasoma is exemplary only. However, the literary model as presented here should not be confined to the framework of this particular study but regarded as a possible framework for the poetics of *kakawin* literature in general. The model is divided into four broad "modalities" or literary functions, which are in turn subdivided into more specific aspects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Author and Text (Narration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Epic Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Epic Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Suspense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Modus Dicendi (Forms of Representation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Linguistic Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Epic Breadth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The Represented (Unities of the Represented)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Epic Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Represented Reality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. As for another instance of applying Jauss's model to ancient Javanese literature with a particular emphasis on *kidung* literature, see Vickers (1986).

2. 1.4 Suspense is added to 1. Author and Text. The first three subdivisions under 2. Modus Dicendi (2.1 Nonwritten vs. Written, 2.2 Verse vs. Prose and 2.3 Level of Style) are all subsumed under the new 2.1 Linguistic Forms. Finally, the first two subdivisions under 4. Modus Recipiendi (4.1 Degree of Reality and 4.2 Mode of Reception and Social Function) are all integrated into one under 4. Modus Recipiendi.
4. Modus Recipiendi (Reception of the Narrative and the Social Function)

1. Author and Text (Narration)

It is implicit in the organization of Jauss's original model, especially in its distinction between the first function of the narration and the third of the represented, that Jauss presumes what may be called "narrativity" in all the genres that are dealt with in the model. Although narrativity may be represented both in a verbal form, oral or written, and in a non-verbal form, painting for instance, what concerns us here is a verbal form only. Then, briefly, narrative is defined as the verbal recounting of a succession of events which are alleged to have occurred and which are communicated by addresser to addressee (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 2). Thus, a narrative text differs from other literary texts, such as lyrical poetry, on the one hand in that it represents a succession of events, and from a dramatic performance on the other hand in that in it the events are verbally recounted rather than physically enacted.

Recognition of narrativity is particularly important for our study because it has been often overlooked that principal genres in ancient Javanese literature, kakawin as well as parwa and kidung, all share narrativity. For instance, in his monumental study on kakawin literature Zoetmulder fails to mention that a kakawin text is above all a narrative probably because it may have seemed to him too obvious to be significant (1974). However, as Barthes convincingly demonstrates, we cannot dismiss the study of narrativity "on the grounds of its universality" (1977: 80) but instead should posit it as integral part of the study of ancient Javanese literature in general and of kakawin literature in particular. Robson is one of a few who has drawn our attention to the narrativity of kakawin literature. He asserts "if we attempt to go beyond a merely formal description of kakawin and say something about content, then the fact that it is basically narrative will already be apparent from its parallelism with the Sanskrit 'court epic', the kāvya" (1983: 301).
The definition of narrative introduced above already presupposes its basic constituent aspects: a succession of events, their verbally recounted representation and the act of communication by an author to an audience. I shall call these aspects, after Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 3), “story”, “text” and “narration” respectively. 3 “Story” is defined as:

the narrated events, abstracted from their disposition in the text and reconstructed in their chronological order, together with the participants in these events. (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 3)

While “story” is thus a part of the “reconstructed” or “represented” world in which the characters live and the events take place, “text” is a concrete object which the reader confronts. 4 It is:

3 The distinction between the aspects of narrative and their designation vary among theorists. The Russian Formalists distinguish between “fabula”, the raw materials of a story awaiting process by the author, and “sujzet”, the story as arranged and narrated by the author. This distinction was later incorporated into the two-aspect system advocated by French structuralists, who, drawing on Benveniste’s linguistic observation, made a distinction between “histoire” and “discours” (Todorov 1977: 25). In this system “histoire” is a succession of events as they would have happened in the real world, whereas “discours” is the narration of the story assuming a speaker and listener. In Todorov’s words, “story” entails “the world of the characters” whereas “discours” involves “the world of the narrator–reader couple” (1977: 26). Chatman follows this system in his distinction between “story” and “discourse” (1978). However, if one opts to make a further distinction within the “discours” between the concrete text as the result of authorial arrangement and the abstract process of narrating, then the three-aspect system is required which consists of, using Genette’s terms, “histoire”, “récit” and “narration” (1972). Some theorists, notably Rimmon-Kenan (1983) as in her “story”, “text” and “narration”, and Bal (1985), have accepted this system, though Bal’s English edition adopted the rather confusing terms “fabula”, “story” and “text”.

4 Something must be said here about the “reconstructed-ness” of story as opposed to the concrete objectivity of text. Although story is often described as raw material to be transformed by the author into the literary text, as in the Russian Formalism, it is actually a construct abstracted from the process of reading the text. This means that the author of the Sutasoma did not start off by conjuring or picking up
If the text is a spoken or written discourse, then it must assume an agent who speaks or writes it to another agent who listens or reads it. This process of producing a text is the third aspect "narration" with the agents being author and audience respectively. Rimmon-Kenan summarizes the relations between these three aspects:

It is through the text that he or she [the reader] acquires knowledge of the story (its object) and of the narration (the process of its production). On the other hand, however, the narrative text is itself defined by these two other aspects: unless it told the story it would not be a narrative, and without being narrated or written it would not be a text. (1983: 4)

Thus the narratological distinction of the three aspects provides a relevant complement to Jauss's model. The model's first function corresponds to "narration", in which the relations between the author, text and audience, and also between the narration time and the story time are dealt with. While the second function concerns the formal aspects of "text", the third function consists of elements of "story". Finally the
last function brings us to an extratextual aspect of a narrative text, namely, the social function of narrative text.

1.1 Narrator

Under this heading Jauss basically deals with the mode of contact between the author, text and audience in the process of literary communication. Epic is an oral hence direct communication, for the author is in the presence of an audience. He orally composes a poem and at once sings it to the audience, like a medieval jongleur did. Then once the story starts being told, "the author retreats behind material, so that the occurrences seem to narrate themselves" (Jauss 1982: 83). Whereas romance and novella are a written hence indirect communication, for there is no direct contact between the author and audience except through a written text. The story is not told directly by the author but mediated by the narrator in the narrative who recounts the story to the audience, though the degree of the perceptibility of the narrator is different in romance and novella: in romance "the author steps forward as mediating narrator behind material", while in novella the narrator is more or less covert, for "the mediating narrator for the most part conceals himself in that which is narrated" (Jauss 1982: 83).5

Unlike the medieval epic, the text of *kakawin* literature as well as *parwa* and *kidung* was essentially a written text throughout the process of production, transmission and reception. Although it is difficult to know how literary communication took place in ancient Javanese society, Zurbuchen's remark on *pepaosan* (group literary reading) in modern Bali provides an interesting insight:

5 Chatman lists several types of manifestation of overt narrator. They are, in increasing order of perceptibility: description of setting, identification of characters, temporal summary, definition of character, reports of what characters did not think or say, and commentary (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 96–8). All types are frequently used in *kakawin* literature.
The relation between the individual and literature in Bali is not that of the one-to-one, passive, visual consumption of a fixed, silent text such as has become usual in some Western societies. Rather, the Balinese experience of literature is multi-sensory, participatory, communal, and socially integrative in nature. For the participant in pepaosan, literature is more process than an object. The literary performer experiences the interweaving of reading, sounding, listening, speaking, and contemplation, while for other persons present there is an immediacy of both musical and verbal meanings that is close to the model of preliterate oral-aural synthesis. (1987: 92)

Zurbuchen is right in emphasizing the dominance of orality in Balinese society, which may in all probability have been the case in ancient Javanese society. Nevertheless her remarks highlight the fact that the texts need to be read. This makes a fundamental difference between the Balinese mode of literary communication, where literary texts are primarily written, and the “preliterate” mode of literary communication, where the poet himself, like the medieval jongleur, recounted a narrative text directly and orally to the audience.

While the author may not be directly present in the literary communication through written texts, the narrator does. The narrator is an agent who is represented in the narrative, recounting the events, and so constructing the text (Bal 1985: 119–20; Prince 1987: 65). The narrator, overt or covert, has no less decisive a role in the narrative text than other elements, for, as Bal asserts, “the identity of the narrator, the degree to which and the manner in which that identity is indicated in the text, and the choices that are implied lend the text its specific character” (1985: 120). Although the identity of the narrator is not the same as the author of the narrative, and in theory should be distinguished from that of the author, the narrator in kakawin texts is a special kind of an overt narrator in that the narrator is not only presented to the reader but also proclaims himself to be the “author”. Typically, this “author–narrator” presents himself in the introductory stanzas, in which he invokes a guiding deity or a
royal patron, who in turn may be identified with the deity, as having the supernatural power to bring his work to a satisfactory completion, such as the hero's victory over the evil demon. And then in the concluding stanzas at the end of the narrative, he discloses his name and the title of the story and apologizes for the imperfection of the work. Sometimes the author-narrator's reference to himself in the opening and closing stanzas becomes so extensive that it may be called "biographical," as in the case of the Kađiri poet mpu Panuluh, who depicts himself in the closing stanzas of the Hariwangsa as a young poet who wanders in natural beauty in the hope of gaining inspiration for his poems (Zoetmulder 1974: 170). Although the narrator becomes most overt at the both ends of the text, his presence is also felt in the process of recounting the story. A sudden but smooth switch of scenes is a clear indication of narrational manipulation by the narrator. In the Sutasoma narrative we witness a series of changes of scenes, for instance, from the palace of Hastina to the hero Sutasoma in the countryside (9.1), from the summit of Mount Meru to the gods' council (43.1) then back to the mountain (47.3), from Sutasoma and Daśabāhu to the princess Candrawati in the palace of Kāśi (58.1), from the kingdom of Hastina to the demon king Poruṣāda (94.1) and so forth. The discontinuity of the narration of a certain event and the beginning of a new scene is often marked by such phrases as "byatīta" ("let us not speak about . . .") in stanzas 43.1, 47.3 and 94.1,7 "ndan sang sri naranāthaputra

---

6 The deity or person who is invoked in the introductory stanzas is called manggala. This term literally means "anything that brings blessing, ensures success or a happy issue" (Zoetmulder 1982: 1109). When the manggala is a person, "he is a kind of patron or protector, but is often distinct from the person who actually commissions the work, generally a king or member of the ruling family. The word manggala can sometimes be applied to something other than a person, but it is never used to refer to the introductory passage of kakawin, as scholars of Old Javanese have regularly done" (Robson 1983: 310). Also see Zoetmulder (1974: 173).

7 Robson (1971: 243) points out the use in the kidung Wangbang Wideya of a similar expression "enēngakēna" ("let us be silent about . . ."), which is "part of the technique of story-telling and indicates a transition from one topic to the next."
caritan” (“let us now tell about the prince”) in stanza 9.1, and more sophisticatedly in stanza 58.1 “lunrâŋ ṭāṭa Jinendramûrâti sira rakwa kâtêmu sira de nareśwara” (“the news that the king had found Jinamûrti [Sutasoma] spread on all sides”), which enables the narration to switch the scene from the king and Sutasoma to the palace where the news is in everyone’s mouth.

Although the “author–narrator” is the most perceptible narrator in a kakawin narrative, he is by no means the only narrator in the narrative. Genette has proposed a useful typology of narrators according to the narrative level to which the narrator belongs (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 94–6). The type of “author–narrators” in kakawin texts is an “extradiegetic” narrator, that is, the primary narrator who, being positioned outside the story, narrates the primary story of the text. Most of kakawin “author–narrators” are at the same time “heterodiegetic”, meaning that they do not take part as characters in the story. Because of their absence from the story and their position in the highest level of narrative strata, they usually assume the quality of “omniscience”, which is associated with such characteristics as “familiarity, in principle, with the characters’ innermost thoughts and feelings; knowledge of past, present and future; presence in locations where characters are supposed to be unaccompanied; and knowledge of what happens in several places at the same time” (Rimmon-Kenan 1985: 95).

Besides the author–narrator, however, it is possible to find a character in the story told by the author–narrator, who assumes a role of a narrator and recounts a secondary narrative. This narrator is then called “intradiegetic”. The intradiegetic narrator, usually superior to other characters in knowledge, is often used as a convenient agent to communicate new information to other characters as well as to the audience without breaking the continuity of the story. The most significant instance of the intradiegetic narrator in the Sutasoma narrative is the Buddhist sage Sumitra, who

Robson also suggests that “the use of such transitional expressions might be taken as evidence for the descent of the literary form of the kiduṭ from an older, oral one.”
explains the genealogical relation between Sutasoma and Daśabahu (18.2–19.5), the miraculous birth of the latter (19.8–20.9), and the genealogy of Poruṣāda and his transformation to the man-eater (22.1–23.5). The most intriguing case, however, of the status of the narrator may be found in the fourteenth century kakawin Nāgarakṛtāgama. Prapañca, the author–narrator of the narrative, is extradiegetic as the primary narrator, but unlike other kakawin narratives he is also “homodiegetic”, for he himself appears as a character in the main story which he narrates. This accounts for his less than omniscient status, which results in the limitation on his knowledge as “narrator–character” and the need to introduce a knowledgeable character as the intradiegetic narrator, the venerable Buddhist monk Ratnāṅga, who can recount the genealogy of the ancestors of king Rājasanagara (39.1–49.4).

1.2 Epic Objectivity

In the oral transmission of medieval epic, the singer–narrator’s attitude toward the story and narration is characterized by what Jauss calls “epic objectivity”. By this Jauss means that the singer–narrator asserts the definiteness, completed-ness and incontestable truthfulness of the epic narrative by stating these qualities directly to the audience. “Epic formulas, such as the assertion of truth, participation in the hero’s fate, and epic forestalling” are some devices which ensure “epic objectivity”; they construct “an emotional unity between jongleur and audience” (1982: 84). While Jauss’s formulation involves orally transmitted medieval epic, the same effect is achieved by the author–narrator’s commentary in the written transmission of kakawin narrative.

Commentary is the most perceptible manifestation of an overt narrator in that the narrator intervenes in the narration to express himself instead of simply describing settings and recounting events (Chatman 1978: 219–52). Some forms of commentary can be made on the story, such as interpretation where the narrator explains the meaning or significance of an element of the story, or judgement where the narrator makes a value judgment, or generalization where the narrator refers to the general
knowledge about the extratextual world (Prince 1987: 14; Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 96–9). On the other hand commentary can be also made self-consciously on the narration itself.

In *kakawin* texts all of these types of commentary are used to indicate "epic objectivity". The author–narrator’s modesty in embarking on the narration and reverence for the story expressed at both beginning and end of the narrative, as we have already seen in the previous section, is a kind of a commentary on the narration itself which indicates "epic objectivity" by lifting up the *kakawin* as an object to be revered. There are more intricate instances of the use of commentary in the Sutasoma *kakawin*. At the beginning of the story, the author–narrator narrates:

1.4 . . . / Previously in the *dwâpara*, *treta* and *krtâ* ages [yuga], the embodiment of all forms of the *dharma* / were none other than the gods Brahmâ, Wiśṇu and Īśwara. They became kings in the world of mortal men. / But now, in the *kali* age, śrī Jinapati descends here to eliminate the evil and the wicked.

This passage is a commentary which foretells the inevitable elimination of evil by the hero, the incarnation of Jinapati (Buddha) at the end of the story. It also points out to the audience the significance of the incarnation of Buddha as saviour in the *kaliyuga*, the last and worst age of the cosmic cycle in which even Hindu gods are powerless. The story proper begins after this passage, with the episode of the miraculous birth of the hero Sutasoma and his identification with Jinapati. However, as if simply telling the story was not enough to convince the reader, the author–narrator repeatedly intrudes into the story by commenting on the hero’s identity: for instance, stanza 3.7 "Singgih yan Jinamûrti śuddhakulawangṣaja" ("He was indeed the incarnation of Jina,

---

8 In this thesis Old Javanese texts and English translations of the Sutasoma *kakawin* are taken, with some modifications if necessary, from Soewito-Santoso (1975).
born of a noble family”) and stanza 42.3 “tuhu yan Jinamūrti sākṣāt” (“Indeed he was the incarnation of Jina in bodily form”).

The narrator’s commentaries or argumentative statements give a particularly important insight into the horizon of expectation of the text, because they are usually the places where the author’s norms and ideology are most directly expressed. Yet, at the same time, as Bal points out, we should be also wary of being so “naive [as] to suppose that only argumentative parts of the text communicate ideology. This may happen equally well in descriptive and narrative parts of the text; but the manner in which this happens is different” (1985: 129). The allegorical mode of reading a *kakawin* text, which we shall discuss later in this chapter, is one of the ways to understand how descriptive and narrative parts of the text can convey ideology.

1.3 Epic Distance

Since narration is a speech act, it takes place in a certain temporal setting, hence has a temporal relation with the events in the story. This relation, which can be measured in terms of distance between the time of narration and that of primary story, is another constitutive feature of genre. In *kakawin* texts the author-narrator narrates “now” in the time contemporary with the audience, whereas the events represented in the story have occurred in the, usually distant, “past”. It is at this point that Jauss introduces the notion of “epic distance” to describe a special kind of temporal distance in epic literature. He states that “from the epic distance the occurrence appears as a wholly past one”, yet the narrative can hold the reader’s attention because “the epic

---

9 Narratologists generally argue about “distance” in terms of the temporal distance between the primary story and the secondary story in a narrative text. This sort of distance also exists in *kakawin* texts. In my view, however, the notion of distance has wider implications going beyond narratological plane. The distance between narration-time and primary story-time is more pertinent than distance in a narrower sense to the formation of genre. It seems to me that narratologists neglect the importance of distance in this wider sense because they tend to take a narrative as given and do not attempt to situate it in a historical perspective.
forestalling makes possible the pathos of the ‘how-suspense’” (1982: 84). To elucidate the significance of the notion, we now turn to Bakhtin, another theorist who has recognized “epic distance” as an important feature of epic genre.

Bakhtin has suggested three correlated features which characterize epic as a genre: (1) “a national epic past” which “serves as the subject for the epic”; (2) “national tradition” as opposed to “personal experience and the free thought that grows out of it”; and (3) “an absolute epic distance” which “separates the epic world from contemporary reality, that is, from the time in which the singer (the author and his audience) lives” (1981: 13). The epic past is the “absolute past” because “it lacks any relativity, that is, any gradual, purely temporal progressions that might connect it with the present. It is walled off absolutely from all subsequent times, and above all from those times in which the singer and his listeners are located” (1981: 15–16). However, paradoxically, this past has an intrinsic tie with the present, since the world represented in the epic is not merely “past” but “national past”. It is the “world of fathers and of founders of families”, therefore the “world of ‘firsts’ and ‘bests’” (1981: 13). Hence, the author assumes “the reverent point of view of a descendant” who is “speaking about a past that is to him inaccessible” (1981: 13). Because the epic world is in the absolute past, has its own norms, and has ancestral values which the present author and audience can do nothing but revere, “it is impossible to change, to re-think, to re-evaluate anything in it. It is completed, conclusive and immutable, as a fact, an idea, and a value” (1981: 17). Needless to say, this immutability of the epic past is further enhanced by what we have called “epic objectivity”. Moreover, not only in the content but also “in its style, tone and manner of expression, epic discourse is infinitely far removed from discourse of a contemporary about a contemporary addressed to contemporaries” (1981: 13–14).

Although the narrational relation of the narrating present and the represented world in the “epic past” is marked by the “epic distance”, the gap is mediated by “national tradition” in the reception, because “the epic past . . . is preserved and revealed only in the form of national tradition” (1981: 16). However, the importance
of tradition lies not so much in its role as the factual source for the epic as in its function of providing “a commonly held evaluation and point of view”, which are to be regarded as “sacred and sacrosanct”, and commanding “a profound piety toward the subject described and toward the language used to describe it” (1981: 16–17). In other words, national tradition constitutes a horizon of expectation for epic texts.

In *kakawin* literature the past is founded on the Indian notion of past. According to this system of four *yuga*, the temporal span of our world is divided into four *yuga* or ages, that is, *kṛtayuga*, *tretāyuga*, *dwāparayuga* and *kaliyuga*, each lasting 4,800, 3,600, 2,400 and 1,200 divine years respectively. Corresponding to the decrease of their length, the four *yuga* are arranged in an escalating order of social and moral degradation. The first age is the golden age while the last is the most degraded age in which we now live. Thus, each *yuga* is set apart from one another by its own morals and standard of values. The first *yuga*, the *kṛtayuga*, is the most distant and absolute past, so distant that only divine beings appear as characters in stories set in this period, as exemplified in the mythological episode of the churning of the milk ocean recounted in the first half of the Ādiparwa. Although the story itself is notionally distant from Javanese society, it has gained a significant position in Javanese “national tradition” especially in its recounting of the origin of *amṛta*, an important symbolic object of Hindu-Javanese culture. The stories set in the second *yuga*, *tretāyuga*, involve the Rāmāyaṇa cycle. *Kakawin* works produced in various periods belong to this cycle: the *Sumanasāntaka*, written in the thirteenth century, recounting the romance of Aja and Indumati, whose grandson is Rāma; the *Arjunawijaya*, recounting the origin of Rāma’s future antagonist Rāwaṇa and his capture by Arjuna Sahasrabāhu, written in the fourteenth century; and the Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin*, which recounts the adventures of Rāma and his victory over Rāwaṇa, written in the ninth century. Although the time and place of the stories are set in India in the distant past, the main characters are now represented by humans. While the main antagonist, the demon king Rāwaṇa, is reminiscent of the preceding age, the hero Rāma, although an incarnation of Viṣṇu, behaves as a mortal on the earth. The stories
in the third yuga, dwāparayuga, are mostly dominated by those of the Mahābhārata cycle, whose main characters, the five Pāṇḍava brothers as protagonists and the hundred Korawa brothers as antagonists, are all humans, though their fathers are Hindu gods. Several kakawin works from different periods recount various parts of this colossal epic: the Arjunawiwāha from the eleventh century tells of the deeds of Arjuna while the Pāṇḍava are in the twelve year exile; the Bhāratayuddha from the twelfth century recounts the battles between the Pāṇḍava and the Korawa, which result in the former’s victory. Another group of stories, which we may call Krṣṇa cycle include such kakawin as the Hariwangsa, Krṣṇāyana, Ghaṭotkacāstraya and Bhomāntaka, which recount stories of Krṣṇa and his sons, and are also set in this age. In fact, the characters and plots in this cycle are inseparably linked with those in the Mahābhārata cycle. The end of the Pāṇḍava’s reign signals the end of “epic past”, since it brings kāliyuga, the age of confusion and destruction, the age in which we at present are.

Thus, the very fact that the stories are set in the first three ages ensures that they are set in the epic past. The epic past, however, can be connected to the narrational present. There are two notable devices in kakawin literature for this purpose. The first device is the notion of incarnation. The epilogue of the Bhāratayuddha, for instance, declares that in the kāliyuga Wiṣṇu has been reincarnated on the island of Java as king Jayabhaya, by whom the author was commissioned to compose the kakawin to praise the victorious deeds of Krṣṇa, Wiṣṇu’s incarnation in the tretāyuga (Zoetmulder 1974: 270). The other device is genealogy. Even in the Central Javanese court in the eighteenth century “the Indian gods, the Pandawa heroes of the wayang epics, went straight down to the Central Javanese kings, to form the left-hand line of descent” (Koentjaraningrat 1985: 330).10

---

10 Brandon demonstrates that in Javanese wayang tradition the genealogy of Javanese kingship is perceived as originating from mythical Indian heroes. He also
By these means a link between the characters in the represented world and the audience to which the story is narrated is established, ensuring that on the one hand the narrated world is not only past but "national past" and on the other hand the epic distance with its irreversibility and reverentiality is kept intact.

It is remarkable, therefore, that since the mid-fourteenth century, which marks a half millennium of the continuous production of *kakawin* literature, there were authors who started setting their stories in the present *kaliyuga* instead of the epic past. Tantular’s *Sutasoma* recounts the story of prince Sutasoma, an incarnation of Wairocana in the *kaliyuga*, though the place is apparently still set in India. Prapañca’s *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, composed two decades before the *Sutasoma*, describes the contemporary situation of Majapahit kingdom, a great deviation from India in the past. Then in the mid-fifteenth century Tanakung wrote the *Śivarātrikalpa* (Teeuw et al. 1969), the last major *kakawin* from Java that can be dated with any certainty, which lacks any reference, direct or indirect, to the four *yuga* system. The story, derivative of an Indian *purāṇa* but with no connection with the epic past, is about a lowly hunter which could have happened at any place and time. The appearance of these works may be evidence of a gradual but fundamental change of the horizon of expectation taking shape since the mid-fourteenth century. In this new horizon the authors’ interest appears to have been drawn increasingly toward the contemporary situation. Thus the epic past was abandoned as theme and hence reference to the four *yuga* system became irrelevant. Thus, the *kakawin* *Nāgarakṛtāgama* and the *Pararaton*, a chronicle written in Middle Javanese prose, use the *saka* era for chronicling events to indicate the continuity of time from the past to the present.

The possible development of a new literary horizon can also perhaps be seen in the emergence of *kidung* as a new type of literary genre around the same time as these fourteenth and fifteenth century *kakawin* works. According to Zoetmulder *kidung* argues that the legitimization of kingship has had considering bearing on the perception of the Javanese royal genealogy (Brandon 1970: 16–18).
literature can be divided into Pañji stories, historical kidung and others (1972: 407–38). Firstly, a group of kidung works labelled “Pañji story”, such as the Malat, the Wangbang Wideya and the Waseng Sari, narrate the romance and adventure of the prince of Koripan, generally called Pañji, who sets out to search for the missing princess of Daha. These works are grouped under the same label by virtue of their obvious commonality, namely essentially the same spatial and temporal settings, similar plot structure and main characters who share common traits (Robson 1971: 12). Recently, however, drawing on Jauss’s genre theory, Vickers proposed a new definition of this genre, which he designates “courtly romance” (1986: 171). According to this, the genre is expressed in “tengahan kidung verse, gambuh and their related forms in different media”; its theme represents “the world of the courts and the status of young aristocrats in the kingdom”; and its reception involves “a range of emotional activity felt by producers and audience”. It seems that the new definition is a more appropriate one, for it takes into account the Balinese perception of kidung literature. The subject-matter of historical kidung, secondly, is taken from “the historical tradition concerning the Majapahit empire, covering: the events leading up to the fall of Singhasari and the foundation of the new kingdom, which was in a way a continuation of the former, the internal struggles going on in the first decades of its existence; and the episode of the abortive matrimonial plans of king Hayam Wuruk with respect to the daughter of the king of Sunda” (Zoetmulder 1972: 409). Finally, the Sudamala and its sequel Sri Tañjung may be the most interesting in Zoetmulder’s last category, mainly because they appear to be exceptional. Both stories are genealogically linked with the epic past of kakawin literature, for the Sudamala recounts the deeds of the youngest of the Pâñḍawa brothers, Sadewa and Sakula (Sahadewa and Nakula in kakawin), while the Sri Tañjung concerns their son and daughter. Thus, although the two kidung works share the same linguistic characteristics as other kidung, they share the same temporal and spatial settings with the majority of kakawin works. This last case may be seen as an example of “mixed” genre. Kidung texts in general set their represented world not any more in India but in
Java and in a past which is not very distant from the narrational present. This past might have been regarded as kaliyuga in the old horizon, but in the new horizon the reference to the yuga system as an indicator of the past was completely abandoned.\(^{11}\)

This, however, does not mean that in kidung literature the focus is completely shifted to the contemporary situation rather than epic past. On the contrary, it appears that kidung narratives represent a new kind of epic past, the past not directly connected to the Indian epics nor based on the chronological framework of the four yuga, but epic past nevertheless by virtue of the distance between the narrational present and the represented past. The princes and princesses in the Javanese courts represented in a kidung narrative were no less remote and idealized than Indian heroes in a kakawin narrative for the audience (Vickers 1986: 275–88). It can be said, thus, that in ancient Javanese literature epic past did not remain at the same point but gradually shifted from the past in India to that in Java, as the time in which the author and the audience lived advanced, while the epic distance increasingly diminished, although never to the point where it became nil.

### 1.4 Suspense

Finally Jauss also points out the function of suspense with regard to epic distance. Suspense is always an essential part of narrative, sustaining the reader's attention from the beginning to the end of the narrative. In the case of narrative texts which recount the epic past, the story is often already well-known. Many kakawin works, especially those of the Râmayâna and Mahâbhârata cycles, are in fact the versified adaptations of preceding parwa literature, which are in turn Old Javanese summaries in prose of the Sanskrit epics.\(^{12}\) Therefore, the story, at least the outline of

---

\(^{11}\) This does not exclude the possibility of the reference to kaliyuga as an indicator of the age of confusion and destruction.

\(^{12}\) The fourteenth century kakawin Arjunawijaya, which is a part of the Râmayâna cycle, provides an example. In the epilogue (73.1) the author–narrator
the story, had been already incorporated into the horizon of expectation and the reader had become familiar with its contents when the kakawin rendition appeared, although there are many deviations on the side of kakawin from the parwa. Hence the effect of suspense “how-suspense”, the suspense deriving from the question “how is it going to happen?”, is predominant in the process of reading this kind of narrative.

On the other hand, as for the narrative texts which are not related to the Indian epics, such as the Sutasoma narrative, the predictability of the course of the story is naturally expected to be much smaller. In fact the effect of suspense of the Sutasoma is predominantly based on “what-suspense”, the suspense deriving from the fact that the reader is confronted with a story which is a previously unknown one. What the reader may safely presume is that there will eventually be a happy ending in the end of the story. It is interesting to note, however, that the kidung narratives recounting the courtly romance story, which is also unrelated to the Indian epics, are intertextually connected to each other to such an extent that the course of the story in general has become predictable. Thus, the effect of suspense of these kidung narratives is predominantly that of “how-suspense”. This fact, together with the use of epic distance, accounts for the epic-like character of the courtly romance kidung.

2. Modus Dicendi (Forms of Representation)

2.1 Linguistic Forms

Jauss has brought together under this heading four aspects which concern the way the story is represented; the first three, orality, prosody and style, being linguistic, whereas the last pertains to the opening and closure of the story (1982: 84–5). For Jauss the distinction between nonwritten and written literature, or in other states: “Thus ends the versification of the tale that begins with the story of Daśāya; it is called the Triumph of Arjuna, a well-known story that has been told again and again” (Supomo 1977: 73). The kakawin is known to be based on the Old Javanese Uttarakaṇḍa, the prose translation of its Sanskrit counterpart made in the late tenth century (Supomo 1974: 18–26).
words orality and literacy, is crucial in determining the linguistic aspects of literary genres in medieval literature. Epic on the one hand is orally delivered, probably being orally composed, to a nonliterate audience. The "formulaic style" of assonantal versification and elevated style which features the paratactic syntax are also necessitated because of the oral composition of epic literature.\textsuperscript{13} Romance on the other hand is composed in writing and intended for reading, or reading aloud, a habit which also rose from a written tradition. It is written in a type of verse called couplet and in middle style which is "restrictive vis-à-vis everyday reality because of the filter of courtly speech" (Jauss 1982: 84-5). Finally, the novela, written in colloquial prose and in conversational tone, "comes from an oral tradition and enters back into it (1982: 84).

The classification of literary genre based on the degree of orality has been widely accepted in Western literary history. Epic is "basically and irremediably an oral art form", whereas romance is "the product of chirographic culture" (Ong 1982: 158–9). However, this dichotomy is not applicable to the ancient Javanese literary system, though the general distinction of epic and romance remains valid. When Indian literary tradition was introduced to Javanese society, bringing the narrative material and the \textit{kakawin} form, the technology of writing, which had already become commonplace in literary transmission in India, was also imported.\textsuperscript{14} Indeed, without written transmission of texts, the importation of Indian literary tradition across the great distance between India and Indonesia would have been impossible. Since then, the technology of writing has been utilized to write and copy not only \textit{kakawin} and \textit{parwa}

\textsuperscript{13} For a more detailed study of characteristics of oral literature, including epic formula and paratactic syntax, and their relationship with orality, see Ong (1982: 16–30; 37–8).

\textsuperscript{14} The first written record of Old Javanese language, found in the Sukabumi inscription, is dated AD 804, about half a century before the appearance of the Rāmāyana \textit{kakawin} (Zoetmulder 1974: 3).
literatures but also later kidung literature.\textsuperscript{15} Thus, it can be said that, unlike the clear division between oral epic and written romance in the medieval literary system, literacy was an integral part of the horizon of expectation in Javanese literary system, and as far as linguistic medium is concerned, the three major Javanese genres share this characteristic with medieval romance.\textsuperscript{16}

While the distinction of orality and literacy does not serve as a criteria for literary classification of Javanese literature, other linguistic aspects do: The language of kakawin and parwa literature is Old Javanese, while that of the kidung is Middle Javanese (Zoetmulder 1974: 26). These two categories are based not exclusively on linguistic but also chronological and prosodical distinctions.\textsuperscript{17} The chronological span of the production of kakawin literature is extensive, enduring from the ninth to fifteenth century in Java and until quite recent times in Bali. Considering this length of time, it is not surprising to discover that there is a linguistic gap between the oldest extant kakawin Rāmāyana, which was composed in the ninth century (and the only known work originated in the Central Javanese period), and the subsequent eleventh

\textsuperscript{15} Kakawin texts themselves provide reference to the activity of writing, for instance, the Sutasoma kakawin 29.7 and 103.2–4, and the eleventh century kakawin Arjunawiwāha 34.8. Zoetmulder has made detailed research on the technical aspect of writing (1974: 126–43).

\textsuperscript{16} This is not to deny the existence of oral tradition alongside written tradition in ancient Javanese society or to ignore the interaction between the two traditions. For instance, a written text may have intertextual relationship with oral tradition, or, orality may have exerted influence on the way a written text was organized. Ong has drawn attention to some aspects of the relation between orality and literacy (1982). This is an area that demands more thorough studies. In this regard it must be also pointed out that, although an Old Javanese text was composed in writing, it has been noted that the text was intended to be sung rather than recited in a speaking voice or read silently (Wayan Bhadra 1937; Robson 1972: 312; Zurbuchen 1987: 87–95).

\textsuperscript{17} It is beyond the scope of this thesis to treat the distinctions of Old and Middle Javanese extensively. For further information, see Zoetmulder (1974: 24–36).
century Arjunawiwâha, the first of a series of *kakawin* produced in the East Javanese period (Zoetmulder 1974: 231–2). It is, then, far more remarkable that the language used in *kakawin* literature remained consistent both phonetically and grammatically throughout the next half millenium from the eleventh century Arjunawiwâha to the fifteenth century Siwarâtrikalpa. Zoetmulder argues that during this period:

there is hardly any evidence of phonetic changes; grammatical divergencies are few and of minor importance. If, therefore, we call the languages of the 11th century poem Old Javanese, there is no cogent reason for denying the same name to that of the 15th century. (1974: 25)

In fact, even *kakawin* texts which originate indisputably from Bali, where the production of *kidung* took place alongside that of *kakawin*, seldom reveal an unmistakable Balinism (Zoetmulder 1974: 28). This linguistic consistency gives rise to an inference that the language used in *kakawin* was a highly artificial and literary one, insulated from the daily language which must have undergone considerable change during the period. The unalterableness of the language of *kakawin* is correlative with epic distance because the former suggests precisely what the latter refers to, that is, the fact that “it is impossible to change, re-think, to re-evaluate anything in” the represented world of epic, for “it is completed, conclusive and immutable” (Bakhtin 1981: 17).

Unlike Old Javanese, few studies have been made on diachronic change in Middle Javanese. However, even a glance at the language is enough to underline the linguistic consistency of Old Javanese. It has been suggested that Middle Javanese came into being as “the speech of everyday life, markedly divergent from the language of the *kakawins*” long before the fall of the Majapahit kingdom (Zoetmulder 1974: 32). Thereafter, the language was gradually formalized, because, “in being used as an instrument of poetry, it became subject to traditional rules and conventions in a similar way to the language of the *kakawins*” (1974: 35). Nevertheless it seems that the language of *kidung* literature never acquired the same degree of linguistic consistency
as *kakawin* literature. An observation of Zoetmulder refers to diachronic change in Middle Javanese:

> As the ties with Old Javanese become gradually looser, we find an increasing number of anomalies and inconsistencies on the points of grammar and morphology—judged from the Old Javanese point of view—and even outright Balinisms, all of which show that Middle Javanese is going its own way and that the gap in the time separating the Hindu-Javanese period in Java from Javanised Bali is steadily widening. (1974: 29)

Thus, in the horizon of expectation, while the language of *kakawin* was expected to be unchanging so that it contributed to the evocation of the epic distance in the story, the language of *kidung* had no such expectation attached to it and was more susceptible to change since the sense of epic distance was weaker in the case of *kidung* literature.

Besides linguistic differences, Javanese literary genres are readily classified by prosodical distinctions. A text of *parwa* literature is essentially an Old Javanese prose text which recounts an abridged version of episodes from the Mahābhārata, or from the Rāmāyana in the case of the Uttarakāṇḍa, punctuated with passages quoted from the original Sanskrit text. Texts of *kakawin* and *kidung* on the other hand are written in verse, but employing two different metric systems by which the two genres are clearly distinguished.

The versification of *kakawin* literature is regulated by the number and quantity of syllables. Zoetmulder has given a full account of its system (1974: 101–21). His extensive survey on the metres used in over thirty *kakawin* reveals that “with a few exceptions the metric rules for the *kakawin* are the same as those Sanskrit prosody as used in the *kāwyas*” (1974: 102). In fact he goes on to assert that the term *kakawin* itself is an emulation of the Sanskrit term *kāwa*, both derivative of the Sanskrit noun *kavi* (poet). The fact that *kakawin* prosody makes a distinction between long and short vowels (*guru-laghu*) indicates that Javanese poets who composed *kakawin* in Old
Javanese must have laboured with Sanskrit prosody, for this distinction is absent in Austronesian language group, to which Old Javanese belongs.\textsuperscript{18}

However, despite a general adherence of \textit{kakawin} to Sanskrit prosody, there are some discrepancies between Indian and \textit{kakawin} prosodies. Zoetmulder's study demonstrates that more than half the meters used in \textit{kakawin} do not appear in Indian handbooks of prosody (1974: 111). There is also a strong tendency in \textit{kakawin} works, in particular those written in the East Javanese period and afterwards, to prefer longer meters.\textsuperscript{19} In fact, while Anuṣṭubh, one of the commonest meters of Sanskrit poetry, consists of only eight syllables and other preferred meters in Sanskrit poetry rarely exceed twenty syllables, the most commonly used Old Javanese meter Jagaddhita has twenty-three syllables. Interestingly, although the name is clearly Sanskrit, this Old Javanese meter is not found in any of the Indian handbooks. Thus, Zoetmulder has come to the conclusion that "a large number of the metres which we do not find in India must have had their origin in Java. \textit{Kakawin} poetry, though strongly indebted to India, developed into a form with characteristics of its own which became a well established tradition, from which no subsequent poet could, or at least did, dissociate himself" (1974: 111).

The deviation of \textit{kakawin} prosody from Sanskrit prosody attests to a tension in the horizon of expectation of \textit{kakawin} literature. The epic past, the contents of \textit{kakawin}

\textsuperscript{18} Apparently among later Javanese poets this distinction lost its significance. In Modern Javanese poetry the term is not \textit{guru-laghu} any more but \textit{guru-lagu} "teacher of the melody", meaning "the conventionally designated vowel endings and their fixed pitches in each line" (Day 1981: 17).

\textsuperscript{19} Day conjectures that this tendency is due to "the factor of copiousness in Javanese language, song and literary style" (1981: 63). Although it may be the case, I am inclined to think that this is due not so much to the characteristics of Javanese language as to those of Sanskrit language. Sanskrit can be very economical in the use of words compared with other languages because of the ease of making compound words and its highly inflectional nature which do away with adverbial devices otherwise necessary to indicate grammatical features such as person, number and tense.
works, demanded that the author adhere to Sanskrit prosody, despite its constraints on the composition in Old Javanese, for, as Bakhtin has asserted, not only in the content but also “in its style, tone and manner of expression, epic discourse is infinitely far removed from discourse of a contemporary about a contemporary addressed to contemporaries” (1981: 13–14). To solve the dilemma, Javanese poets appear to have had to resort to the invention of pseudo-Sanskrit metres, which were of Javanese origin but which followed the pattern of Sanskrit metres so that they were still suitable for describing the epic past. This—together with other stylistic features, such as copious use of words of Sanskrit origin, figures of speech fashioned after śabdālatrīkāra (sound embellishment) and arthatrīkāra (rhetorical embellishment) in Sanskrit literature—contributed to the formation of a coherent horizon of expectation of kakawin literature, which may be characterized as “Indian”. On the other hand, the emergence of kidung literature marked the formation of a new horizon of expectation, which may be characterized as “Javanese”. The distance between the narrational present and the narrated past is not that of epic any more. Kidung literature introduced human characters in Javanese settings as well as a new prosody which was far more in accordance with the characteristic of Javanese language.20

2.2 Epic Breadth

The last aspect to be dealt with in this section is not so much about linguistic as about the way the narrative is organized. While epic distance sets the distance between the narration time and the story time, the notion epic breadth concerns at what points of the story time to start and end the story within the narration.21 The story time of epic,

20 For the detail of kidung prosody, see Zoetmulder (1974: 121–5). The abandonment in kidung prosody of the distinction between long and short syllables is its crucial difference from kakawin prosody.

21 The question of the beginning and end of the story is also a neglected one by narratologists.
however, is usually vast and cannot be contained in a single narration. This is true in particular of *kakawin* literature in which the time of the represented world of *kakawin* literature extends through three *yuga* which amount to 10,800 divine years. Throughout these periods of time, a number of events and happenings are connected through a complex cause-effect relationship, and characters are related through genealogy and incarnation. Jauss calls this characteristic of epic genre “epic breadth” which refers to the fact that the story has “neither beginning nor definitive end” (1982: 85). It is again Bakhtin who gives us a further insight into epic breadth:

> The epic is indifferent to formal beginnings and can remain incomplete (that is, where it concludes is almost arbitrary). The absolute past is closed and completed in the whole as well as in any of its parts. It is, therefore, possible to take any part and offer it as the whole. One cannot embrace, in a single epic, the entire world of the absolute past (although it is unified from a plot standpoint)—to do so would mean a retelling of the whole of national tradition, and it is sufficiently difficult to embrace even a significant portion of it. But this is no great loss, because the structure of the whole is repeated in each part, and each part is complete and circular like the whole. One may begin the story at almost any moment, and finish at almost any moment. (Bakhtin 1981: 31)

A literary series which we may call *Rāmāyaṇa* cycle in Old Javanese literature is a case in point. Each work that belongs to the series contributes to the representation of the absolute past in which Rāma and his associated characters lived by providing its own piece of the whole picture. The first work to be composed and to become the core of the series is the ninth century *Rāmāyaṇa* *kakawin*. Based on an Indian version of the Rāma story, *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, it recounts Rāma’s search for his abducted wife Sītā, the battle with the demon king Rāwaṇa and his victorious return with Sītā to the kingdom of Ayodhyā. Then in the tenth century the *Uttarakāṇḍa* in Old Javanese prose appeared. Although this is not a *kakawin* text, without doubt it must have contributed to the formation of the way in which the *Rāmāyaṇa* cycle was received by
Javanese society. The work, which forms the last of the seven parts of the Indian Rámâyāna, relates the events after Rāma's return. The first half of the work involves the sage Agastya's intradiegetic narration which, going back to the time before Rāma's birth, recounts not Rāma's lineage but the origin of his principal antagonist Rāwaṇa, his fight with and capture by Arjuna Sahasrabahu, and prophesies his future downfall at the hands of Rāma. In the second half of the Uttarakāṇḍa the narration returns to the main story which recounts the accusation made against Sītā of infidelity and her subsequent exile, her giving birth to two sons, descent to the underground, and Rāma's reign before his ascent to heaven as Viṣṇu. Thus, the Uttarakāṇḍa effectively expands the represented world of the Rāmāyaṇa cycle in the two chronological directions: to the times prior to and posterior to the story of the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin. The technique used in the first half is called "analepsis", a narration going back to the past with respect to the present moment of the primary story-time (Prince 1987: 5). The events in the two story-times are connected not only by the common characters but also by curses and prophesies in the further past, which are used to explain why and how Rāwaṇa's defeat by Rāma must happen in the "present" time. Later in the thirteenth century Monagul, drawing on Kālidāsa's Raghuvarṇa, wrote the Sumanasāntaka, which relates the romance of Aja and Indumati, who are to become grandparents of Rāma. This is again an expansion of the represented world of the cycle in the horizon of expectation. Finally in the fourteenth century Tantular composed the Arjunawijaya, a kakawin adaptation of the first half of the Uttarakāṇḍa, recounting Arjuna Sahasrabahu's victory over Rāwaṇa. Curses and prophesies in this narrative function as "prolepses", a narration going forward to the future with respect to the present moment of the primary story-time (Prince 1987: 77), anticipating the future events recounted in the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin.

Clearly it is not the chronological order in which the works were written but it is the totality of the epic past which they represent that makes them a literary series. The represented past of the Rāmāyaṇa cycle is set in a coherent but vast spatial and temporal setting, India in the tretāyuga, giving accounts of the experience of the
characters over several generations who are genealogically linked, and a multitude of events and happenings which are connected either by cause and effect or by means of curse and prophesy. Because of its extent, the represented time in epic has no definite beginning or ending, but can only be recounted always in part by many works. Proliferation of texts belonging to the Rāmāyana cycle, as well as the Mahābhārata cycle, throughout Indonesian history has been possible, at least in part, because of this fact. The extensiveness and intertextual recountability of epic time, which Jauss calls “epic breadth”, are constituent features of the horizon of expectation. The appearance of a new work, then, should be interrogated in relation not only to the time when it was created but also to the horizon of expectation which had been formed by the preceding works of the same literary series and in which the new work now emerged.

Unlike kakawin works linked with the Indian epic cycles, kidung stories are in general self-contained; there are no prior stories. Thus, as Robson points out (1971: 12), the term “cycle” in the sense it is used in the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata cycles in kakawin literature is not adequate for discussing kidung literature. Consequently, kidung works lack “epic breadth” but instead assume characteristics which Jauss has assigned to the medieval romance literature, that is, the romance story consists of “singular series of adventures” and involves “a closure that no longer refers to any before or after” (1982: 85). It is interesting, then, to note that the Sutasoma kakawin remarkably resembles the kidung literature in that its story also consists of “singular series of adventures”, since it does not belong to any epic cycle but narrates a series of events concerning a particular character. Nevertheless, the Sutasoma kakawin is not devoid of “epic breadth”, for it maintains to some extent “epic breadth” by genealogical and incarnational linkages to the further past.22 On the other hand, a body of the courtly romance kidung stories compensate for the lack of “epic breadth” by sharing fundamentally the same represented world. This intertextual network may be seen as a

22 We shall return to this point in chapter three.
result of an attempt by kidung authors to endow the kidung works with an epic-like quality. If this is correct, the ambiguous position of the Sutasoma kakawin may be attributed to its transitionary nature.

3. The Represented (Unities of Represented)

The third literary function involves the "story" plane, a chronological sequence of events pertinent to characters which are recounted in a narrative. If what we have discussed in the preceding section is the expression or the "how" of a narrative, then the subject of this section is the content or "what" of a narrative (Chatman 1978: 19–26). In the past Javanese literary studies on narrative have generally adopted the approaches either of source criticism, where the main concern is to trace various literary elements such as plot, character and episode back to their original source, often an Indian text, or otherwise of socio-historical orientation, where a story is seen as a field from which one can retrieve information relating to extratextual reality. By contrast, with a few notable exceptions such as Becker (1979), few studies have been carried out which investigate the structure of a story per se by situating it within the context of narrative. Although source criticism and socio-historical approaches are undoubtedly legitimate and necessary, in order to appreciate a kakawin work as a literary text we must first examine the organizing principles which determine the textual structure of a story and their significance for the narrative as a whole. In this context then the aim of source criticism is not so much to determine the origin of textual elements as to understand how the text and the sources are related and how this intertextuality was perceived in the horizon of expectation. Likewise a socio-historical approach should be more concerned with the question of what social conditions, religious and political in particular, caused the narrative to be constructed in the way it was done.

23 I shall review the studies Old Javanese in historical perspective in the following section, where the approaches pointed out here will be examined in detail.
3.1 Epic Action

A story consists of two elements: events and existents, to use Chatman’s terms, with the former being subdivided into actions and happenings and the latter into characters and setting (1978: 15–31). Among these elements, events and characters are in particular interconnected in the sense that an event can be significant in a narrative only with the involvement of characters. Hence an action designates an event caused by a character or characters, whereas a happening is an event which is not caused yet experienced by a character (Chatman 1978: 44–5). This distinction is pertinent to Jauss’s assertion that the events in an epic are action-oriented and those in a romance are happening-oriented. On the one hand “epic action”, he states, arising “from an often minimal cause growing into a catastrophe, has its unity in an objective occurrence that encompasses the world-order” and “its hero is a representative of the fate of his community”. On the other hand “the romance happening—the adventure as a structure for the fulfillment of meaning arising by accident—has its unity in the singular character of the exemplary hero” (1982: 85).

The description of epic action is remarkably pertinent to kakawin literature in general and the Sutasoma in particular. However, happenings also play an important role in certain points in the course of the story. Thus, action and happening are not mutually exclusive but complementary in kakawin literature, although the former is apparently more predominant than the latter. In the Sutasoma story the primary cause which leads to the catastrophe is reported by the Buddhist sage Sumitra to the hero Sutasoma at his hermitage (21.1–23.5). It begins with an incident in which a dog steals a dish prepared for a king. The cook substitutes a piece of meat taken from a human corpse and cooks and serves it to the king. The king, having eaten the meat, turns into a fiendish man-eater and eventually comes to menace the whole world with the armies of demons under his command. The report describes a sequence of events which are firmly connected causally in a chronological order. However, why the events should take such a course is explained clearly only at another epistemological
level of superior characters such as deities and sages. Here the whole sequence turns out to be predetermined by the cosmic order. As the sage Sumitra reveals to Sutasoma, the survival of the entire world is now at stake not because the man-eater is an extraordinarily destructive villain, which he is, but because he is the embodiment of kaliyuga, the age of decay and annihilation. Sutasoma is the only person who can save the world from catastrophe not because he is courageous and mighty, which he of course is, but because, as is clear at the higher epistemological level, he is the incarnation of Wairocana. There are, on the other hand, several instances of happenings, such as a dog’s stealing of a dish and Sutasoma’s encounter with Daṣabāhu, which simply happen as coincidence but nevertheless determine the course of the story. However, whether an event is an accident or happening, what characterizes a kakawin narrative is the fact that the consequence of the events is predetermined by the cosmic order. The coexistence of two epistemological levels, the causal sequence of actions narrated as plot and the cosmic order which predetermines the former, is common in kakawin literature in general. The reader is as a rule privileged to have access to the both epistemologies and is thus able to make better sense out of the story.

Like kakawin stories, the events of kidung stories, too, are characterized by both action and happening. For instance, in the Malat (Vickers 1986: 323–8), a courtly romance story, some important turning points of the story simply happen without any apparent causality, such as the disappearance of the princess of Daa (Daha), her discovery by a king in the forest, and the encounter of the prince of Kauripan (Koripan) with the princess of Singasari. Nevertheless, the story as a whole is developed by a series of actions taken by the hero as a result of his continuous, although often digressing, effort to recover the missing princess. Probably, then, what most clearly distinguishes a kidung story from a kakawin story is the former’s lack of cosmic significance. Compared to kakawin stories, there are far fewer divine interventions in kidung stories and social disorder described in them hardly develops
into a cosmic scale. This is in a sense inevitable because the *kaliyuga*, in which every *kidung* story is situated, is fundamentally the age of mortals. In this context, therefore, the peculiarity of the Sutasoma narrative, in which disorder of a cosmic scale takes place in the *kaliyuga*, may be also considered to point to its transitionary nature.

In regard to the general distinction between action and happening, it is also interesting to call attention to the difference in the way a plot is structured in western narrative and Javanese *wayang* play. Becker argues that the plot of western narrative, which originates as early as Aristotelian poetics, is arranged in the temporal order on the basis of the logic of causality, whereas a *wayang* plot is built around coincidence (1972: 216–26). Unlike a western narrative where temporal order and causality are inseparable, in a *wayang* story an event may just happen without causal connection to chronologically preceding events. Needless to say, “it is not that *wayang* plots may not have temporal unity, causal linear sequences, catastrophes, reversals, and all the rest.” The point is rather that these Aristotelian constraints “are not necessary to a good *wayang* plot, and to focus on, for instance, causal sequences and character development is to miss the area of relevant variation in *wayang* theater and to miss the subtlety and depth of good *wayang*” (Becker 1979: 219).

Although Becker limits himself to *wayang*, his argument has nevertheless further implications. When he notes that “though stories are often imported into *wayang*, chiefly from Sanskrit epics, plots appear to be uniquely Javanese” (1974: 223), he might also have remarked that stories are imported not directly but through Old Javanese *kakawin* literature. In fact, what Becker considers as a dichotomy between western and *wayang* plots is more likely to be two modes of organizing a plot

---

24 There are a few instances of divine interventions in the Malat, which concern the disappearance of the princess of Daa and the encounter of the prince of Kauripan with the king of Tarate Bang. The divine interventions, however, are not predetermined by the cosmic order but instead arbitrary to such an extent that the incidents appear to be accidental.
which have long existed in Java, as well as in western narrative, in different genres. More interestingly, Becker is correctly aware that even in a wayang narrative the coincidental mode of plot structure is not the only one that operates but rather it coexists with the temporal-causal mode of plot structure. It is, thus, not mutual exclusiveness but a degree of dominance that characterizes the operation of the two modes in a wayang narrative. This observation should give us useful insight into how events are ordered in the Javanese literary system. To pursue this line, however, I shall turn to Bakhtin, after discussing the issues of character and represented reality in the following sections, for Bakhtin has proposed the concept “chronotope” which allows us to see the sequence of events, character, and spatial and temporal settings in an integrated manner. In addition, Bakhtin’s approach is more historical and at the same time structural than Becker’s in that he situates a genre in relation to other genres in literary history, thus making the notion of chronotope adaptable to Jauss’s framework.

3.2 Characters

Jauss classifies the characters of epic, romance and novella into high, middle and low respectively according to their social status (1982: 85–6). Among these three classes the characterization of epic and romance is mostly well applicable to kakawin and kidung literatures. The characters of epic literature are “exclusively aristocratic” constituting a kind of feudal hierarchy. “The peak of the heroic hierarchy includes the often-mythified king, followed by the circle of the best, surrounded by normal knights, for the most part nameless.” Likewise, “the heathen opposition reflects the same hierarchy.” In romance literature the central characters are also “exclusively

25 Becker’s warning against western bias in evaluating literary value towards “causal sequences and characters development” would be in particular relevant in approaching kidung literature, for too often in this field we come across scholars’ undisguised preference for a well-told story with good characterization. See, for instance, Zoetmulder (1974: 420).
aristocratic” but “the excluded lower order” appear “in the contrasting figure of the ugly vilain [villain, feudal serf, commoner in French]”. In addition the romance story features the “opposition between the inactive ideal king and the knight who alone takes the field and whose adventure stands in relation to the winning of his lady.”26

The high status of epic characters is readily exemplified by Sutasoma, hero of the Sutasoma kakawin, for he is a semi-divine hero who stands at the pinnacle of an aristocratic hierarchy. As the only son born to the ruler of Hastina, he is destined to inherit the throne of the royal family which descends from the celebrated Pândawa, victors of the war depicted in the Mahâbhârata. In addition to his status, as the heir apparent of the kingdom of Hastina, Sutasoma is endowed with superhuman identity as the incarnation of Wairocana, for his birth is the result of his father’s invocation of the deity. When the hero is finally enthroned, he becomes the peak of an aristocratic hierarchy. The description of the hierarchy occupies a significant portion of the narrative, in particular in the “procession” scene (120.1-7; also 111.5–112.6). Sutasoma’s immediate kin, that is, Ardhana, Sutasoma’s own son, Daśabâhu, who is Sutasoma’s cousin and his most powerful ally, and Daśabâhu’s three sons, are “the circle of the best”, whereas other lesser kings constitute the secondary level of the

26 In classifying characters Jauss draws on Frye, who argues that since the plot of narrative fiction consists of someone doing something, narrative fictions can be classified by “the hero’s power of action” which may be greater or less than, or equal to the other characters (1990: 33–4). Thus, a myth is about a divine hero who is “superior in kind both to other men and to the environment of other men.” A romance is about a human hero who is “superior in degree to other men and to his environment.” The high mimetic mode is about a hero in leadership who is “superior in degree to other men but not to his natural environment.” The low mimetic mode is about a hero, like ourselves, who is “superior neither to other men nor to the environment.” Finally, the ironic mode is about a hero who is “inferior in power or intelligence to ourselves.” It is evident that Jauss’s epic and romance correspond to myth and romance respectively in Frye’s system, giving us an insight into an intricate relation between character and action in kakawin and kidung literatures. In general Frye’s approach to narrative genres convincingly demonstrates the inseparability of character and action.
On the other hand the protagonist, the man-eater Poruṣāda, is not a lone villain either, but has his own hierarchy. The narrative has an elaborate description of the "procession" of Poruṣāda's army (113.1-114.9). He is firstly followed by three human kings, namely, kings of Kalingga, Magadha and Awangga, and then by an army of demons, including the powerful and loyal minister Wimona.

While what we have seen of the characters of the Sutasoma kakawin is generally applicable to other kakawin works, the characters of kidung literature show affinity with romance characters. Like romance characters, the heroes in kidung literature are exclusively aristocratic as in the courly romance kidung stories which recount typically the romance between the crown prince of Koripan and the princess of Daha, or as in so-called historical kidung which involve aristocratic members of the Singhasari and Majapahit courts. In addition, apart from a few exceptions, these characters are all regarded as humans. However, unlike the medieval romance, the

27 A remarkable exception is the Siwarātrikālpa, which I mentioned in the previous section in regard to its disconnection with "epic past". The hero is a hunter from an extremely low social class. Its temporal setting and characterization make the narrative atypical of the kakawin genre. Thus the editor of the text observes that the descriptions of the hero's "domestic life, his conversations with his wife, and so on, touching in their humanity, are very unusual for Old Javanese literature" and also that "the description of his illness and death are unique in their portrayal of the everyday life of the ordinary man" (Teeuw et al. 1969: 32).

28 The mode of characterization of the Harsawijaya, a historical kidung, appears to be slightly different from other kidung works. In the story, upon seeing the prince Harsawijaya, who is to be the first king of Majapahit, the usurper Jayakatwang's court brahmin predicts that the prince is destined to become king because he looks like an incarnation of Viṣṇu (Zoetmulder 1974: 412). Then, when Jayakatwang is about to be defeated he "gives himself up to meditation and suddenly vanishes into the air, to the admiration of all who witness this supernatural end of a truly great king" (1974: 414). This supernatural mode of characterization contrasts with that of the courtly romance kidung, where, for example in the Wangbang Wideya (2.58a), the antagonist king is slain and decapitated (Robson 1971: 142-3); this may indicate the work's connection with the Pararaton which also operates in a similar mode.
antagonists of kidung literature do not emerge from “the excluded lower order” but
from the similar aristocratic stratum, although it is interesting to note that, as we shall
discuss in detail in chapter five, the antagonists are usually considered to be unfit to
marry the heroine because of their genealogical background. In general, the courtly
romance kidung display greater similarity than other kinds of kidung literature to the
medieval romance since their basic plot involves the prince, in search of the missing
princess, undergoing a series of adventures, including combat with the protagonist,
who is a prince rejected by the princess, finally leading to the hero’s reunion with the
princess.29

3.3 Represented Reality

In the last section of the literary function of the represented Jauss addresses the
issue of the epistemological status of the world represented in a narrative. He identifies
epic, romance and novella respectively with the symbolic, exemplary and descriptive
mode of the representation of the reality.30 Thus, in epic literature “only a few
symbols for the outer world frame the portrayal of heroic acts; the latter are
differentiated through symbolic gestures and elevated through typological references”
(Jauss 1982: 86). In kakawin literature, and in particular in the Sutasoma kakawin, the
symbolic mode of representation is, as we shall see in detail in the following chapters,

29 It may be pointed out, in this connection, that although Sutasoma, the
hero of the Sutasoma kakawin, basically functions as an epic hero who saves the
world from cosmic destruction, he also shares certain traits with the romantic hero of
the Pañji story as a unmarried crown prince who obtains an ideal spouse after a period
of wondering and then returns to the kingdom as married king.

30 Jauss formulates that “the novella is able to represent the outer world as an
environment of a variety of things through its conversational tone as well as through a
new circumstantial manner of description” (1982: 86). Although I do not treat the
descriptive mode of representation in itself, this does not mean this mode does not
exist in kakawin or kidung literature, but only the other two modes are far more
dominant in the ancient Javanese literature.
reflected in the story’s spatial and temporal settings as symbolic space and also in the hero’s biographical trajectory as the symbolization of spiritual progression. On the other hand, in romance literature “the exemplary, stylized courtly world forms the framework within which the excluded unideal reality is transformed into elements of a magical opposing sphere, and elevated through the fairy tale-like fortune of the ‘outer world’” (Jauss 1982: 86). The exemplary mode of the representation of the court world operates predominantly in the courtly romance *kidung*, in which events take place in the environment of *kraton* in Java, typically of Koripan and Daha, although what Jauss formulates as “the excluded unideal reality”, the *vilain* protagonist, is not applicable here. It is obvious that the courtly romance stories were composed on Bali and “it was the Balinese *kraton* which served the authors as model” (Zoetmulder 1974: 408). Nevertheless, as Vickers demonstrates, they were received by the audience “as an authoritative presentation of the Javanese courtly culture on which Balinese kingdoms were found” (1986: 277).

To complete the discussion about the implications of this section without loosing sight of the interrelation between the story elements: events, characters, and temporal and spatial settings, we must now turn to Bakhtin’s notion of “chronotope” (Bakhtin 1981). The term chronotope designates, as its literal meaning in Greek “time-space” suggests, the “set of distinctive features of time and space within each literary genre” (Todorov 1984: 83). The two categories of time and space, being always concurrent with each other, are an integral part of our process of organizing the perception of the world as an intelligible whole. The way the two categories operate in our perception is most revealing in literary texts, where time and space are concretized into temporal and spatial settings and are also materialized in event and character in the form of the hero’s narrative trajectory. A certain form of chronotope, operating in a narrative, necessarily corresponds to the way the extra-textual world is represented in the narrative. Since the perception of the world is shared by a society in a definite historical moment, the form of chronotope is also specifically determined by the historical context in which the narrative is produced and received. Moreover,
according to Bakhtin, it is the chronotope that defines genre and other various intrageneric subcategories in literature (Clark and Holquist 1984: 280).

The adaptation of the Bakhtin’s insights to Old Javanese narratives is possible largely because of his concrete mode of thinking which prevents him from falling into the pitfall of treating a narrative either as a mere sequence of events or as an abstract reduction of the story into a definite set of thematic units. Instead he insists on seeing a narrative structure in its historical context, in which the narrative was produced. Among all the chronotopes Bakhtin has suggested, the three major forms of chronotope which are found in the Greek and Roman literature, are important to our understanding of kakawin and kidung literatures. Although these three chronotopes are distinct from one another, the use of each chronotope is never mutually exclusive. As Becker has pointed out in regard to the opposition of the coincidental and temporal-causal mode of plot structure, the multiplicity of ordering principles is not an exception but rather a rule. Indeed Bakhtin himself is well aware of the multiplicity of chronotopes in a single narrative and the possible dominance of a particular chronotope over others. He asserts:

within the limits of a single work and within the total output of a single author we may notice a number of different chronotopes and complex interactions among them, specific to the given work or author; it is common moreover for one of these chronotopes to envelop or dominate others. (1981: 252)

We shall see that this is the case with the Sutasoma kakawin, in which not only the symbolic mode of the representation of the reality in Jauss’s sense is involved but also two types of chronotope operate in it with one chronotope being dominant over the other.

The first form of chronotope, which Bakhtin names “adventure time”, is also the simplest (Bakhtin 1981: 86–110). As is made clear by his own examples of several Greek Romances, it features a simple plot consisting of two major events. A young couple meet and instantly fall in love, but are separated. After going through a series of
incredible incidents, they are finally reunited and marry. The meeting and marriage of the couple are the only major events of the plot. The other happenings between these two moments simply heighten the significance of the two events in the plot by interrupting and suspending the immediate occurrence of the second event. Time and space in this chronotope are essentially abstract and nonspecific. The story can be situated in any geographical space and historical time. The abstractness of the temporal and, to a lesser extent, spatial settings implies the lack of maturation of characters during the course of the story. These “flat” characters are hardly given any chance to use their initiative over the development of the story. They remain pawns in the hand of fate.

The second category of chronotope is more concrete in spatial and temporal settings as well as in characters. Bakhtin calls this the “adventure time of every day life”, for this newly introduced concreteness enables the description of everyday life to be incorporated in the narrative (Bakhtin 1981: 111–29). The space is now socialized by being set in a definite social environment. And, more importantly, time is punctuated by the successive metamorphoses of the hero in the course of the story. The hero, not being any more merely dictated to by the tyranny of chance, assumes individual responsibility and begins to respond actively to his fate by using his initiative and accommodating himself to situations. Fate becomes individual and personalized and is not any more a sequence of unexpected happenings like a bolt from the blue. As is the case in Bakhtin’s own example, the Golden Ass, events which the hero undergoes in this chronotope leave decisive traces on his characterization which culminate in his biographical progression. But interestingly, despite dramatic changes, the hero maintains his individual identity throughout (Clark and Holquist 1984: 282–3).

“Biographical time” is the third and most complex chronotope Bakhtin identifies in early Western literary history (Bakhtin 1981: 130–46). Although he counts a number of varieties, “Platonic time” demands attention in its own right. It is “biographical” time because the story develops along the course of the hero’s life. In
this regard it is a natural extension of "adventure time of everyday life". But it is also "Platonic" because the hero seeks truth through the life course, as it is most precisely expressed in such works of Plato as the Apology and the Phaedo. Time is the chronological foundation of the course of life on which the hero moves to seek true knowledge. His life course is divided into specific and well-defined stages, as he moves "from self-confident ignorance, through self-critical scepticism, to self-knowledge and ultimately to authentic knowing" (Bakhtin 1981: 130). The life course in quest of truth is also entwined with the spatial setting in a symbolic way. "Space is symbolic, and features such as height and length are indicators not only of distance but also of conceptual difficulty and progress toward the truth" (Clark and Holquist 1984: 285).

Among these three chronotopes it is "adventure time of everyday life" that is most readily recognized both in the courtly romance kidung and in the Sutasoma kakawin. In the courtly romance kidung space is highly socialized, as it is set in eastern Java at the time of the kingdom of Majapahit. Time is also punctuated by the successive changes of the status and name of the princely hero, who demonstrates during the period of metamorphosis his maturation and readiness to become king through the display of bravery in battle, skill in courtly arts, the ability to control emotion, and the acquisition of spouses (Vickers 1986).

What is said about "adventure time of everyday life" in the courtly romance kidung is essentially true of the Sutasoma kakawin, although details are different. In this narrative, as we shall discuss further in the following chapter, the spatial setting is highly socialized by the "Indian-ness" of topography on the one hand and by the "localization" of this Indian landscape in Java on the other. Through these processes events occur not in abstract unnamed places but in specific places, and the life of the hero is firmly situated in social order. Each toponym in the narrative is specifically

---

31 The hero's genealogy is another factor which puts the hero in social orientation. See stanzas 1.5, 18.2–19.5.
designated by an Indian, or at least Indian-like, name. Most of these Indian names refer to the Hindu-Javanese literary tradition. For example, the name of the hero's kingdom Hastina signifies the capital city of the Korawa and later of the Pândawa in the Mahâbhârata cycle. Through this intertextual reference toponyms in the narrative are tied up with one another in the topographic network perceived in the Hindu-Javanese literary tradition. Besides being subjected to the process of "Indianization", space is divided into several types of "localized" landscapes, notably pura and wana. These landscapes provide not only physical settings in which events occur but also provide social and symbolic significance according to which the events are to be interpreted. While space becomes concrete, time is also specific in terms of the temporal setting. The time of the narrative is significantly set in kâliyuga, in which the deterioration of a social order symbolically manifests itself in the form of demons taking over control of the world.

However, what makes the Sutasoma narrative more complex in terms of chronotope and distinguishes it from the courtly romance kidung is the fact that more than one chronotopes operate in it. The Sutasoma story depicts the hero Sutasoma's biographical progression through several stages of life in which he successively assumes differing identities and social statuses. In this context, "Platonic time" becomes dominant and the symbolic mode of representation is more discernible. From the viewpoint of this chronotope three major stages can be schematically discerned in the hero's life. The first stage is set in the opulent palace (pura), where Sutasoma is born as crown prince and brought up until he decides to renounce the princely life. In the second stage he becomes a devout ascetic who sets off on a journey through the wilderness of wana to the sacred Mount Meru. The journey, according to Indian topography, represents the movement from the secular domain to the central and highest point of the world, thus symbolically signifying the process of the hero's quest of the ultimate truth. His attainment of the truth is illuminated by his transfiguration to the Supreme Buddha, Wairocana, in meditation on the summit of the mountain, which then transforms itself into the symbolic space of the mañçala. Then in the third stage,
having realized his real identity, the hero returns from the mountain to pura to assume the kingly responsibility of protecting his kingdom and people from the demonic force of annihilation. Thus, the story of the Sutasoma, in which the story elements: action, character, and spatial and temporal settings are all realized in the chronotope of “Platonic time”, symbolizes the process of attaining the essentially Buddhist ideal, namely, integration of wisdom and compassion, and the legitimation of kingship in the Buddhist context.32

4. Modus Recipiendi (Reception of the Narrative and Social Function)

In the previous section we have seen that spatial and temporal settings, character, and events constitute a story world which represents reality in varying manners: symbolic in kakawin and exemplary in the courtly romance kidung. A narrative of each literary genre in turn projects upon the reading community its particular way of the representation of the reality. In this context Culler’s assertion that “the novel serves as the model by which society conceives of itself, the discourse in and through which it articulates the world” applies equally to ancient Javanese literary narratives (1975: 189). It is precisely this function of creating the verbal model through which the reader conceives reality that situates a narrative text within its social context. The narrative is thus related to the “social” not only because it refers to the socio-historical reality but also because it is capable of projecting a representation of society upon the reader through its reception.

In the receptional function Jauss identifies three aspects: degree of reality, mode of reception and social function, which I shall deal with as a whole for convenience’ sake. The degree of reality is the perceived degree of a narrative’s relation to the reality. It may range, as Scholes and Kellogg have put it, from “empirical” in the sense that the narrative is perceived to be related to specific events

32 We shall return to the issue of “Platonic time” in the Sutasoma narrative in chapter four with a special reference to religious situations.
and situations, to "fictional" in the sense that the narrative is perceived to be related to more generalized reality (1966: 105). The medieval epic is empirical in that it was perceived by the contemporary reader as historical truth, for it "clings to one place or to names made known through history" (Jauss 1982: 86). On the other hand, the romance is fictional, for it "follows the fictional principle of the fairy tale, that in the adventure no occurrence may be like reality", though the courtly narrator makes claim to moralities in the fiction (1982: 87). While the degree of reality conditions the reader's epistemological perception of the narrative text, the mode of reception conditions the reader's emotional reaction or intellectual attitude in receiving the text. In the reception of the epic its depiction of the heroic deeds, which are perceived to happen in the reader's national history, evokes admiration and emotion, whereas the romance is received as entertainment, because of its fictional fairy tale-like nature, and the same time as instruction, because of its exemplification of the court morals (1982: 86–7). Finally, the degree of reality and the mode of reception contribute to determining the social function, the perceived function of literary texts in the social context. It is in this aspect of the receptional process that the represented world in a narrative text converges with the social discourse. Thus, the epic functions as the "primary form of historical transmission for the nonreader, in which the national history of an ideal past is transposed and elevated into an epic-mythic system of world-explanation". The social function of the romance on the other hand experienced change from the original one as "the initiation into courtly life and courtly love" to one as "an entertainment for the private reader" (Jauss 1982: 87).

Despite a general correspondence between ancient Javanese and medieval literatures, to which we have so far called attention, it is in the receptional function of literature that the difference between medieval and ancient Javanese literatures is the most apparent and crucial. Therefore, before turning to kakawin and kidung themselves, we must first elucidate the social conditions which directly regulated literary production in ancient Javanese society. As for the relation between literature and society, Robson has pointed out that "the artistic product can also be seen to have
a more direct, functional relation with the particular social milieu in which it was created” (1983: 292). Thus, questions to be answered are: what segment of society was a literary work produced in and for; what particular aspects of society were addressed in the work. In fact, these two questions are correlated, for the aspects which are dealt with in a work necessarily reflect the interests of the social segment which the work is aimed at.

In ancient Javanese society the ability to compose poetry was regarded as a highly desirable quality for a courtier in general, but it was a group of professional poets residing in the court who created the poems which have come to us (Zoetmulder 1974: 151–4). In court society, along with other groups of officials, attendants and servants, these courts poets comprised a particular functional group which is referred to as para kawi in Javanese literature. Zoetmulder surmises that “their activity may in the first place have included the study of the texts, both religious and secular, which were preserved in the kraton; and the preservation of these texts through copying and recopying must have been an important part of their task” (1974: 156). This tradition continues and extends in the description of court life in kidung literature, where we often encounter “the para kawi appearing in masked dances and comical intermezzos, as story-tellers and bards, and as singers and musicians” (1974: 156). Thus, ancient Javanese literature can be defined as “court literature” in the sense that it was predominantly created by court poets for a courtly audience with, as we have seen in the previous sections, its characters and spatial settings pertinent to the court.

In most of the kakawin works the poet explicitly acknowledges in the opening or closing stanzas that he received patronage, or sometimes the commission for a work, from either the king or a member of the royal family. In these stanzas as a rule the poet praises the patron, sometimes royal, as manggala and apologizes for his incompetence in composing the poem, but often in so doing reveals that the work’s implicit aim was religious. The opening stanzas of the Ghaṭotkacāśraya, composed by the poet Panuluh of the later Kaḍiri period, give a typical example (Robson 1983: 310–1):
1.3 The illustrious king Jayakṛta, that distinguished ruler, is in very truth the Lord Viṣṇu; it is well known that in former times he was Kṛṣṇa, and has again taken on human form as a guardian of men, because he was anxious lest the world be destroyed and the Creator's work be to no avail, for when the divine Rudra annihilates it how could the world not be swept clean away, if he should not take pity on it?

1.6 There is nothing troubling His Majesty's mind, now that the enemies have been swept away; at his ease he espouses the arts, to the joy of the poets who sing of him in their verses. He is pressing and urging me to undertake it, and this is why I am composing the tale of Arjuna's son, but let it be the illustrious Kṛṣṇa who is followed in the story, for his actions are comparable to the king's, as most eminent patron.

In stanza 1.3 the Kaḍiri king Kṛtajaya is identified as the incarnated Viṣṇu, who has come to the earth to protect people from the disturbance caused by evildoers and to prevent the cosmic annihilation by Rudra, the destructive appearance of Śiwa. Then in stanza 1.6 the king, after having accomplished his tasks, is said to commission the poet to compose the poem which is to become a story about the romantic relationship between Arjuna's son and Kṛṣṇa's daughter, thus including in the story the king himself as "the illustrious Kṛṣṇa", Viṣṇu's other celebrated incarnation. In this way the passage points to an interesting receptional function of the narrative. Firstly through the reception of the narrative the present king is legitimized as the incarnation of Viṣṇu, the deity traditionally regarded as the protector of the world through his many incarnations. The identification of the king with the deity makes it possible to identify the king with one of the main characters of the story. Thus the way is open for the appreciation of the narrative to be perceived as the admiration of the deeds of the king himself. The king's perceived glorious deeds in the narrative in turn authenticates the first claim that the king is the incarnation of Viṣṇu.
The case of the Gaṭotkacāśraya illustrates a peculiarity of the receptional function in *kakawin* literature, that is, the close connection in the narrative between political discourse, in particular that of kingship, and religious discourse. This was intended to establish the legitimacy of kingship, a matter of supreme interest in Javanese court society. An important point is that the two discursive planes are not dealt with separately but integrated into the structure of the narrative.³³ Needless to say, not all *kakawin* works describe the patron as a deity or as one of the characters in the story, as in the Gaṭotkacāśraya. For instance, in the case of Tantular, his royal patron Raṇamanggala is never identified as a deity or as a character in his two *kakawin* narratives. At this point we should be reminded that, as Robson has pointed out (1983: 294), we modern readers are conditioned to “think in terms of clearly defined fields and to put such things as social organization, the arts and religion into separate categories, each with its own label”. However, this is no more than our horizon of expectation and it would be misleading if this horizon is applied uncritically to the reading of ancient Javanese literature, for “the three fields mentioned above are just aspects of one complex thought” in the Javanese horizon of expectation. Therefore, the significance of the reception of *kakawin* literature lies not so much in the mythological identification explicitly stated in a specific prologue or epilogue, which may or may not exist, as in the general process of integrating politics and religion into the narrative.³⁴

³³ Panuluh applies the same strategy as in the case of the Gaṭotkacāśraya, integrating political and religious discourses into the narrative in his other two existing *kakawin*, Hariwangśa and Bhāratayuddha, in which the earlier Kaḍiri king Jayabhaya is identified as the incarnation of Viśṇu and also appears in the both narratives as Kṛṣṇa. An example of the strategy is also found in another Kaḍiri *kakawin* Smaradahana, composed by Dharmaja, in which the Kaḍiri king Kāmeśwara is identified as the incarnation of the god of love Kāma, whose incarnation is the hero of the narrative.

³⁴ The integration of political and religious systems in ancient Javanese society is also pointed out by Weatherbee (1968: 17–18).
A particular mode of literary reception used extensively in *kakawin* literature to accomplish the link between political and religious discourses is an “allegorical” mode of reception, first put forward by Berg (1938a) with regard to the *kakawin* Arjunawiwāha, and later extended by Robson (1983) to the *kakawin* genre in general. The Arjunawiwāha was composed by Kanwa between 1028 and 1035 during the reign of Airlangga, whose name appears in the epilogue as the royal patron. Berg has argued, drawing on other sources of information, that the hero Arjuna’s deeds and celestial wedding in fact refer to the king Airlangga’s career. Thus the appreciation of the *kakawin* can be regarded as the praise and legitimization of the king. Aichele has also advanced the view that Rāma in the *Rāmāyana*, the oldest existing *kakawin* composed in the middle of the ninth century, can be allegorically linked with the historical king Rakai Pikatan (1969). Taking his cue from them, Robson has convincingly argued that the allegorical mode of reception generally operates in the *kakawin* genre, using several *kakawin* works as examples. The operation of the allegorical mode is usually subtle and embedded in the story itself, as in Arjunawiwāha, where the knowledgeable contemporary reader must establish the allegorical link through the similarities between the narrative and the extratextual reality.

Thus, to return to Jauss’s framework, the degree of reality in *kakawin* literature may exist at two levels. On the immediate level the narrative was perceived as representing national history, albeit distant and often imbued with heroic deeds of the ancestor or the incarnation of the king. On a deeper level it was perceived as allegorically representing specific persons, events or situations in the contemporary society. In the latter case the representation may operate on any narrative level from settings, characters, events to the whole plot. Then the mode of reception is on the first level that of admiration of the character’s valiant deeds and glorious victory, and on the second level that of inquiry into the allegorical meaning which may have had immediate political and religious significance for the contemporary reader. Finally, the social function of *kakawin* literature was to provide an interpretation of national history.
and the way of perceiving the world, which was primarily intended to legitimize kingship by relating political ideology to religious mythology. However, there are also instances where the social function reflects the intention of the author, for the process of modeling the represented world necessarily involves the author's commenting on or interpreting the socio-historical reality. Several aspects of the operation of the reception of the Sutasoma \textit{kakawin} will be issues we shall examine in the following chapters.\textsuperscript{35}

While the basic mode of reception of \textit{kakawin} literature appears to have been allegory, the mode of reception in \textit{kidung} literature does not fall within one kind, because of the diversity of the genre. It may be possible, however, to describe prominent characteristics in two major subgenres of \textit{kidung} genre, namely the historical \textit{kidung} and the courtly romance \textit{kidung}. Both \textit{kidung} genres represent the formative period of Majapahit kingdom which must have been perceived as national past by the reader in the Balinese courts, which continued the Javanese tradition. More importantly, the immediacy of the past must have also been felt by the reader, for the past described in \textit{kidung} is not set in distant India as in the case of \textit{kakawin} but in East Java, the memory of which was still preserved in the community. Thus, it appears that the receptional function of the two \textit{kidung} genres was "historical" in the sense applicable to medieval epic, and provided the Balinese reader with an "interpretation of history" which was more immediate and concrete than that in \textit{kakawin}.

\textit{Old Javanese Studies in Retrospect}

Jauss's horizon of expectation suggests a direction in which we may advance the study of Old Javanese literature. It is towards the construction of the Old Javanese poetics in the sense of "a systematic theory of literature, an account of the modes of

\textsuperscript{35} Apart from the social function of \textit{kakawin} literature as discussed here, Zoetmulder has suggested the function of \textit{kakawin} as the meditative means of the poet. This will be discussed in details in the following section.
literary discourse and of the various conventions and types of organization which produce meaning in literature" as opposed to the practice of commentary or interpretation (Culler 1977: 8). The notion of genre, the horizon of expectation which makes possible the production of meaning, will be central to the poetics as defined as such. In the history of Old Javanese studies, pioneered by Friedrich in the middle of the eighteenth century, though much advance has been made in our understanding of the literature, attempts to construct its poetics have been frustrated partly because the available data of the literature remains insufficient and partly because of the absence of indigenous texts on Old Javanese poetics. Nevertheless a number important contributions have been made to this end. In this section I shall review these contributions to see what has been done and not in the light of the horizon of expectation

Kakawin as the Derivative of Indian Poetics

As early as in 1926 Aichele identified in the Old Javanese Rāmāyana, the oldest kakawin known to us, some types of alamkāra (embellishment) expounded in Indian textbooks on prosody. They are anuprāsa (a kind of assonance or alliteration), yamaka (a kind of assonance or alliteration), rūpaka (metaphor), utprekṣā (poetical fancy), apahnuti (concealment) and upamā (simile). As can be understood from their English translations, the first two types belong to śabdālamkāra (sound

36 The Wṛttasañcaya, published by Kern in 1875, is one of a few Old Javanese handbook on the composition of kakawin. However, the text is exclusively dedicated to metres. This apparent lack of interest in poetics in general may be "due to the neglect on the part of Old Javanese scholars of the theoretical side of the composition of poetry" (Supomo 1977: 42).


embellishment) and the others to arthālārṇṅkāra (sense embellishment), the two principle divisions of alārṅkāra. The exact definition of each technique is often obscured by technical subtlety and is of little relevance here. It will suffice to say that the former is a means of producing an euphonic effect in the process of reading aloud a text, whereas the latter operates at the semantic level of text reading. At any rate the implication of Aichele’s contribution is twofold: In the first place he enables us to recognize the importance of embellishments, both sound and semantic, which readily fit in with what Jauss calls the aspect of linguistic forms in the horizon of expectation. Secondly he indicates a possibility that aspects of the horizon of expectation may have been derivative of classical Indian poetics as epitomized by such Indian theoreticians as Daṅḍin and Bhāmaha.39

In spite of Aichele’s contention, embellishments, in particular embellishments of sound, were often considered by some scholars who worked in the early stage of Javanese studies to be non-essential to the point where they were purged from texts as later interpolations. Hooykaas, who not only introduced Aichele’s seminal papers into Dutch scholarship but also fully developed their implication, summed up the puritanical attitude which prevented some from seeing the significance of embellishment in Old Javanese:

The habit of silent reading and the use of Javanese script, I am inclined to think, account for the fact that the extension of the use of yamaka and assonance in the OJR [Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa] has been seriously underrated; and the rationalistic trend of mind shared by Kern, Juynboll and Poerbatjaraka made these scholars

39 Daṅḍin and Bhāmaha flourished in the late seventh century as major figures of classical Sanskrit literature. Aichele used Daṅḍin’s Kāvyādaṛśa. Hooykaas also used it as well as Bhāmaha’s Kāvyālaṅkāra as “testing rod” (Hooykaas 1958: 41) to identify alārṅkāra in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa kakawin. They chose the two works not because they presumed both works were known to the author of the kakawin but because the works represented the best formulated example of Indian poetics prior to the production of the kakawin. Hooykaas, however, did not deny the possibility of the Indian poetics being directly directive for the kakawin.
so disapproving of such embellishments that they postulated other hands than that of the original poet to make them. (1958: 34)

The significance of embellishment in Javanese poetics, including pun, alliteration and assonance, has been extensively studied by Day (1981), who maintains that embellishment is not merely “incidental” to a theme and form, and thus “meaningless”, as many western scholars think, but an integral part of the process of sense-making in Javanese poetics.40

However, though the recognition of embellishment gives us an insight into aspects of the horizon of expectation of kakawin literature, it is the second implication of Aichele’s contention that Hooykaas further pressed to establish a more comprehensive understanding of kakawin as a literary genre. Taking his cue from Indian scholars, Hooykaas proved beyond doubt that the major part of the Râmâyana kakawin was actually derived from the Sanskrit Râvanaavadha (the death of Râvana), a rendition of the celebrated Râmâyana story, which has been popularly known as Bhaṭṭikāvya after the name of its author Bhaṭṭi (Hooykaas 1955). Having scrutinized the two texts, Hooykaas reached the conclusion that the first 56 % of the Râmâyana kakawin and the first 65 % of the Bhaṭṭikāvya “run closely parallel” (1958: 5). Thus passages in the Râmâyana kakawin which were previously rejected as interpolation because of their supposedly superfluous embellishments and irrelevant subject matter now turn out to be derivative of the Sanskrit work.

More importantly, the Bhaṭṭikāvya has a special position in the history of Sanskrit literature because of its explicit purpose to illustrate the rules of Sanskrit poetics while narrating the well-known Râmâyana story. Its tenth to thirteenth cantos, for instance, are exclusively devoted to the illustration of poetics, including thirty-eight alamkāra. Although the poetics which Bhaṭṭi used as his model is not known, it

40 However, unlike Hooykaas, who stresses in the Indian origin of kakawin embellishment, Day emphasizes the indigenous impulse toward ornamental style (1981: 33).
appears to belong to a tradition close to Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha (Gupta 1970: 115). From these facts Hooykaas asserted that not only the alārīkāra in the kakawin derived from classical Indian poetics but the entire kakawin was modelled on the same poetics. He then advanced a hypothesis that the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin was also, like the Bhaṭṭīkāvya, intended by the author to be an “exemplary” kakawin, to be used as literary model by Javanese poets in the following generations. In this context he refers to Balinese literary tradition in which the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin has been considered to be the “adi-kakawin” (the first and oldest kakawin). He conjectures that there might have been a number of precursory and shorter poems before the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin, which were then forgotten after its appearance (1958: 5). Thus the composition of the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin represents the creation of a new horizon of expectation, the genesis of kakawin as literary genre, one which was in effect modelled on Indian poetics through the first exemplary kakawin.

To measure to what extent the kakawin complies with the definition of mahākāvya (major poem) as expounded by the authority of Sanskrit poetics, in particular in the choice of subject matter, Hooykaas used Daṇḍin’s Kāvyadarśa as “a testing rod”. The passage which is relevant to our concern runs as follows:41

1.14 Composition-in-Cantos is a long poem and its definition is being given: Its opening is a benediction, a salutation, or a naming of the principal theme.

1.15 It springs from an historical incident or is otherwise based upon some fact; it turns upon the fruition of the fourfold ends [artha, kāma, dharma and mokṣa] and its hero is clever and noble.

1.16 By description of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons and risings of the moon or the sun, through sportings in garden or water and festivities of drinking and love;

41 The translation of the passage from the Kāvyadarśa 1.14–17, 21 and 22 is taken, with some modifications, from Hooykaas (1958: 13).
1.17 through sentiments-of-love-in-separation and through marriages, by description of the birth-and-rise of Princes, and likewise through state-council, embassy, advance (=journey, march, etc.), battle and the hero’s triumph

1.18 [the poem is] embellished; not too condensed and pervaded all through with poetic sentiments and emotions; with cantos none too lengthy, and having agreeable metres and well formed joints,

1.19 and in each case furnished with an ending in a different metre—such a poem possessing good figures-of-speech wins the people’s heart and endures longer than a kalpa.

1.21 Having first set forth the hero with his excellences, through him to secure the defeat of his enemies: this is a mode natural-and-pleasing.

1.22 While, having delineated the family, the manliness, the learning and so forth even of the enemy, to assert, through his triumph over him, the pre-eminence of the hero, is what is approved by us.

Hooykaas demonstrates that there is a significant correspondence between the subject matter and prosody of the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin and the norms described in Indian poetics (1958: 41–6). Following Hooykaas’s method, Supomo asserts in his analysis of Tantular’s Arjunawijaya kakawin that even as late as the second half of the fourteenth century this kakawin was composed to comply with the norms expounded in Indian poetics (1977: 43–7). Comparing the Arjunawijaya kakawin with its literary source, the Uttarakāṇḍa written in Old Javanese prose, Supomo came to the conclusion that “the need to conform to the norms for the composition of kakawin, both in form and in content, is responsible for the modified, expanded and added passages that occur in the Arjunawijaya” (1977: 46–7). Even more remarkable is the Sutasorna, Tantular’s other work. Although stories which relate the deeds of Sutasorna are found in Indian Buddhist literature, the plot structure of the life story of Sutasorna
as we find it in the *kakawin* is unique to *kakawin* literature. Nevertheless its subject matter and prosody correspond well to the norms of Indian poetics. This predominance of the norms of Indian poetics in *kakawin* literature can be accounted for only if these norms were already integrated into the horizon of expectation of *kakawin* literature.

Although Hooykaas's approach provides us workable assumption about the literary elements which are formative of the *kakawin* genre, it has its own limitations. In the first place, it explicates neither the structural relation between textual elements nor the relation between the *kakawin* genre and other genres. A comparison of the norms in the Kāvyadarśa with Jauss's literary functions will situate them within a more comprehensive perspective. Firstly, the function of narration, the relation between the author and the text, is not well represented in the Kāvyadarśa except for its instruction on the opening where the author is able to express his attitude toward the narrated (1.14). Secondly, the function of forms of representation (modus dicendi) is partly represented in the passage where Dānctin specifies the versification and style of poem (1.18–19). The function which is best represented in the Kāvyadarśa is that of the unities of the represented. As for action, suitable subject matter is specified and ordered in such a way that the stories appear to end invariably with the hero's triumph over the enemy (1.16–17). Desirable traits of the hero, such as cleverness, nobleness, pedigree, are also clearly described (1.15, 21–22). The representation of the natural world is also found, for instance, in the description of cities, oceans, mountains (1.16). Finally, with regard to the function of reception (modus recipiendi), the Kāvyadarśa appears to indicate that a poem should be historical or factual and should convey the four-fold ends of social life to the audience. The comparison shows that Hooykaas's method of applying Indian poetics to *kakawin* literature is in fact compatible with the horizon of expectation suggested by Jauss's framework, but also that it is neither sufficient nor exhaustive enough for us to understand the genre comprehensively.
The second limitation is that while Hooykaas's theory accounts for the aspects of *kakawin* literature which comply with Indian poetics it does not explain deviations. As in the field of versification where Javanese poets did not hesitate, when necessary, to invent their own meters in the guise of a Sanskrit name, a *kakawin* work can deviate from the norms of Indian poetics or may hide under its seemingly Indian appearance something Javanese. This view raises another school of *kakawin* poetics which places more emphasis on Javanese-ness of the literature and its close relation with *wayang* play.

**Kakawin as Wayang Lakon**

In 1925 Stein Callenfels argued that there were two distinguishable trends in Javanese literary tradition: the “court tradition” which was closely related to Indian literary tradition and appreciated by the literate nobles at Javanese courts, and the “popular tradition” which greatly deviated from the Indian tradition and was current among ordinary people: Thus, the *Kršṇāyana* and the *Hariwangśa*, the two late Kadiri *kakawin* works recounting the life story of *Kršṇa*, are classified as belonging to the “court tradition” and the “popular tradition” respectively. The plot of the former closely adheres to Indian tradition while that of the latter radically deviates from the tradition. Stein Callenfels explains this deviation by suggesting that the “popular tradition” is based on Javanese *wayang* play. The idea then leads him to assert that *kakawin* works whose plot do not generally comply with Indian tradition, such as the *Hariwangśa*, were actually composed as a *wayang lakon* (plot) in the form of a *kakawin*. The assertion is not improbable, for a famous reference found in the *Arjunawiwåha* (5.9), in which the performance of puppets made from carved leather is said to create the illusion of reality, testifies that *wayang*, most probably *wayang kulit*, as we know it today had already established itself in Javanese society by the early eleventh century, though its ultimate origin may be debatable (Zoetmulder 1974: 207–12).
Stein Callenfels's use of the terms "court" and "popular" is, however, rather misleading, for the distinction of the inside and outside of court does not necessarily correspond to a clear-cut differentiation of Indian and Javanese traditions. Nevertheless, in spite of this shortcoming, his assertion of wayang tradition in *kakawin* literature was immediately pursued by Poerbatjaraka (1926), who suggested in his study on the Arjunawiwaha the possibility that *kakawin* works might have been composed as *wayang lakon*:

It was obviously the poet's principal aim to write a poem which was fit to serve, without alteration, for a wayang performance. For in such a performance the main theme is invariably the following: the alarm of Good at the apparent or temporary victory of Evil; Good takes refuge with a higher power; assisted by this higher power Good engages in combat with Evil; Evil is defeated, Good triumphs and is restored. (Quoted in Zoetmulder 1974: 241)

To substantiate his argument, great emphasis was put on a similarity between the plot structure of the *kakawin* and that of *wayang lakon* in general, though what he proposes as the general structure of *wayang lakon* appears too general to be considered specific to *wayang* play, thus seriously undermining his argument.

It is Soewito-Santoso in his study on the Sutasoma who takes up again the possibility of the connection between *kakawin* and *wayang*. He refutes Kern's contention that the Sutasoma *kakawin* is directly derivative of an unknown Indian Buddhist text (1912: 145–6), and argues that the framework of the story is basically the Javanese poet's creation with the insertion of motifs from the Indian epics and the Jataka stories (Soewito-Santoso 1975: 36–8). To highlight the Javanese-ness of the *kakawin*, Soewito-Santoso points out some similarities between the *kakawin* and Javanese *wayang lakon* in three areas: plot structure, episode and characterization. The

---

42 I shall discuss the origin of the Sutasoma *kakawin* again in chapter four.
plot structure of a wayang lakon is primarily divided into three parts, each part being associated with a specific “mode” of accompanied music. Each part in turn consists of multiple-combinations of three basic scenes: jejer (audience scenes, in front of a ruler or holy man), adegan (outside scenes, usually involving a journey along the road or in the forest) and perang (battle scenes). As a rule, a combination of the basic scenes begins with jejer followed by adegan and perang in this order, though adegan and perang may be repeated until the next combination starts. There are certain standard scenes, around eighteen in number, which are given special names and arranged in a fixed order, some of which must appear while some of which may not. In the plot of the Sutasoma kakawin Soewito-Santoso recognizes a similar recurrence of jejer–adegan–perang pattern and the culmination of the confrontation between good and evil in a wayang-like order from a minor indecisive battle to a final all-out battle, leading him to the conclusion that there is a strong possibility that the kakawin Sutasoma was created as a lakon to be used for performance (1975: 20–1). Furthermore he asserts that the kakawin consists of two individual lakon. The first (cantos 1–93), which relates the hero Sutasoma’s escape from the palace, meditation in the mountains and wedding, “has a great similarity to the Arjunawiwaha”, whereas the second (cantos 94–148), which relates the confrontation between the ogre’s army and the kings leading to the hero’s pacification of the evil, has a similarity to the Bhāratayuddha wayang lakon (1975: 21). To prove his point, Soewito-Santoso set outs the entire kakawin in such a way that it can be read as two full-blown wayang lakon. He also

43 For more details about the plot structure of Javanese wayang play, see Brandon (1970: 20–31) and Becker (1979: 220–3). Although the plot structure of Balinese wayang play is basically similar to that of Javanese counterpart, the Balinese structure appears to be less rigid and dependent on the dalang’s choice (Zurbuchen 1987: 207–14; Hobart 1987: 146–8). The difference between Javanese and Balinese wayang plays suggests that we need to be cautious in applying the present situation of wayang play to Old Javanese literature.

44 It appears that Soewito-Santoso’s argument at this point has lost some credibility because he actually reformulated the kakawin by inserting a new episode of
points out that some episodes and characters in the *kakawin* are similar to those in such major *wayang* stories as the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Arjunawiwāha*, and *Bhāratayuddha* (1975: 21–2).

A major problem in Soewito-Santoso’s argument is that what he claims to be unique to *wayang lakon* has never been established as such. When he argues for the existence of the similarities between the plot structure of the Sutasoma and the *wayang lakon* of the *Arjunawiwāha* or the *Bhāratayuddha*, the *wayang lakon* of the latter two are never individually analyzed. Thus, unless the similarities are proved to be unique to the *wayang lakon*, they are equally applicable to the *kakawin* story. This is also true of Soewito-Santoso’s argument on episode and character, for the similarities he points out are all found in the *kakawin* stories as well. Unless we have more specific evidence, the similarities can be explained more readily by intertextual influence of other *kakawin* narratives than by extratextual influence of *wayang lakon*. The problem may be accounted for by a confusion between the fact that a *kakawin* can be used as a *lakon*, or more precisely can be read by a *dalang* as a model for a *lakon*, which regularly happens today and must have happened in the past,45 and the contention that a *kakawin* was actually written as a *lakon*.

It seems that in the present state of knowledge about ancient Javanese society we are not yet ready to accept the theory of *wayang lakon* as the origin of *kakawin*. However, this is not to deny the existence of “Javanese” tradition as distinguished from “Indian” tradition in *kakawin* literary production. The Javanese tradition may have exerted influence on the formation of both *wayang lakon* and *kakawin* narrative

---

45 Zurbuchen gives an account of a modern Balinese *dalang* who spent several hours reading and reflecting on the *kakawin* Pārthayajṇa before putting it into a *wayang* performance. The *dalang* had not seen a performance of the story, though he had heard of its being played. Interestingly only about half of the *kakawin*’s cantos were represented in the performance to make a typical three-scene play comprising *jejer–adegan–perang* (Zurbuchen 1987: 217–9).
ever since the time of the first *kakawin*, thus resulting in a notable deviation from the Indian tradition. Zoetmulder is of opinion that it is very likely that this Javanese tradition was responsible for “to some degree determining the choice of subject and the manner in which it was treated” in *kakawin* narratives (1974: 290). Interestingly, in her analysis of Balinese *wayang* play Zurbuchen suggests that the way the authors of *kakawin* poems saw poetic invention may be similar to the manner in which the present Balinese *dalang* do. If this is correct, then like the Balinese *dalang*, *kakawin* poets “often worked on the basis of expanding minor episodes into whole stories, creating new characters typecast within the framework of conventional roles, providing ‘sequels’ and sidelights of already well-known tales” (1987: 216).46 This assertion suggests how *kakawin* poets could deviate from the Indian tradition without fundamentally changing the horizon of expectation.47

Thus, it is most probable that Javanese tradition was an integral part of the horizon of expectation of *kakawin* literature in that not only the tradition supplied subject matter, episodes and characters which were not in Indian tradition, and influenced the way they were organized in a *kakawin* narrative, but also the tradition

46 Becker, too, discusses the mode of invention within the framework of Javanese *wayang* tradition. He argues that “one of the most important differences between traditional artistic expression and modern individualistic artistic expression is that in a traditional medium the artist is consciously expanding a prior text, an open corpus of literature, art, or music, whereas an artist whose intent is self-expression creates and develops his own text, his own mythology, so far as he can still communicate” (1979: 228). It is the former mode of invention that operated in *kakawin* literature.

47 A remarkable example of the influence of Javanese tradition on *kakawin* literature is the creation of the character Kśiti Sundari, Kṛṣṇa’s daughter who married Arjuna’s son Abhimanyu. She is one of the main characters of the Ghaṭotkacāśraya and is also mentioned in the Bhāratayuddha, but she is never mentioned in the Indian Mahābhārata (Zoetmulder 1974: 290). The character must have been deeply rooted in Javanese tradition, for she also appears in both Javanese and Balinese *wayang* plays (Brandon 1970: 70–8; Hobart 1987: 53). The significance of the creation of this character in the light of Javanese social context will be discussed in chapter five.
provided a mode of invention which allowed the *kakawin* author to work on a narrative in such a way that it deviated from Indian tradition or it became a virtually new creation within the framework of Indian poetics. Then in the Javanese horizon of expectation what we see as deviation from Indian tradition may not have been considered as such but rather as a natural development of that tradition.

*Kakawin* as "Poet's Religion"

In the last sections we now turn to two scholars who have paid particular attention to the social function, the fourth literary function in the Jauss's framework, which has not been mentioned in the preceding discussion. Although the two scholars, Zoetmulder and Berg, share a concern about the relation between a *kakawin* narrative and society, their approaches are remarkably different. Zoetmulder on the one hand restricts the scope of his interpretation within what is actually written in texts. His concern is not so much about the function of *kakawin* in the social context in general as about its function in literary circles, namely among the poets. Berg on the other hand is more interested in the political meanings of *kakawin* literature in the society, in particular its function in legitimizing kingship. Therefore an examination of their arguments will give us an opportunity to look into the social function of *kakawin* literature from different points of view.

The first part of Zoetmulder's classical treatise on Old Javanese literature *Kalangwan* (1974) is clearly, but not necessarily explicitly, programmed as a poetics of *kakawin* literature. He presents summaries of *parwa* narratives, which supplied *kakawin* literature with the most of its subject matter, and then he explains Javanese versification used in *kakawin* literature.\(^{48}\) In doing so he makes in effect an extensive

\(^{48}\) Although Zoetmulder produces a comprehensive survey on the versification of *kakawin* literature, curiously he overlooks the significance of sound embellishment in the *kakawin* prosody and the fact that *kakawin* works were intended to be orally reproduced.
survey on the form and narrative content of *kakawin* literature. Then he shifts his
attention to the way ancient Javanese society, especially the poets themselves,
perceived *kakawin* texts. It is at this point that he returns to the question he puts
forward at the beginning of his book: what was “the place that the cultivation of poetry
and of what we may call the cult of beauty (O.J. *Kalangon*) occupied in Hindu-Javanese culture” (1974: 36). The following discussion on the position of *kakawin*
literature, which he describes as the “cult of beauty”, in ancient Javanese culture is
none other than the analysis of its social function. The fact that Zoetmulder gives
particular significance to this literary function over others can be seen from the title he
has given to the book, *Kalangwan*, a variant of the Old Javanese term *kalangon*.

The notion of beauty (*langô*) in Old Javanese literature is a complex one.
According to Zoetmulder’s dictionary the term *langô* designates subjective and
objective aspects of the notion (1982: 976). Subjectively, on the one hand, it means
“the feeling of longing or being entranced (by beauty or love)”, thus “aesthetic
experience, romantic feelings, the raptures of love”. On the other hand, it also refers to
an object which causes the feeling of *langô* as defined above, that is, “all that is
beautiful or lovable, beauty, in particular” including “poetic beauty, poetry”. Hence its
nominalization with the affixes ka—*kalangon* means, among others, “aesthetic
experience, . . . , beauty, the beauties of nature, poetry” (1982: 978). Thus, *langô* is
the state of entrancement caused by beauty, in particular, of nature and love. However,
as the term “cult” suggests, this state of entrancement involves a function of reception
which is not only aesthetic but also religious. Based on his investigation of the
opening stanzas of *kakawin* works, Zoetmulder asserts that for a poet the attainment of
entrancement is comparable to the practice of *yoga*, the unification with a deity in
meditation. The process of creating of a poem then is the erection of a *carûli* (temple)
made from script and sound, into which the *îstadewata*, the patron deity invoked by
the poet, will descend and manifest itself. Subsequently in this receptacle of the deity the literary form of yoga takes places, which, the poet hopes, will enable him to attain mokṣa (final liberation). Zoetmulder summarizes the function of kakawin as follows:

The poem in its visible and audible form, as recorded in the characters on the writing-board and as read or chanted aloud, was conceived of as a receptacle for the god of beauty, into which he was called down and wherein he dwelt as in his temple. It helped the author to achieve the aim of his literary yoga, namely union with his iṣṭadewata. (1974: 185)

Thus, according to Zoetmulder, poetic production was not any more simply literary in character but was a kind of a religious experience, which he calls, as well as the "cult of beauty", "religio poetae" (the poet's religion) or "the yoga of the kawi" (1974: 181). However, though Zoetmulder does address a function of kakawin literature in an extratextual situation, the function remains personal rather than social in its general sense, for its goal is the poet's own attainment of spiritual bliss. The personal nature of "the cult of beauty" will become clearer as we examine Berg's theory in the next section.

Kakawin as "Literary Magic"

Berg also has examined the function of kakawin in their social context, but his approach is remarkably different from that of Zoetmulder in that he takes a kakawin not as a verbal monument, like Zoetmulder, but as a narrative which might refer to socio-historical events and situations, and be endowed with political significance. His method is most persuasively demonstrated in his study published in 1938 on the

---

49 The manggala of the Sumanasāntaka hopes that the deity "may descend in the written poem as into his temple (caṅḍi)." The manggala of the Hariwijaya requests the deity to "find a charming temple (caṅḍi) in the poem when it has received its final definitive form on the writing-board" (Zoetmulder 1974: 176).
Arjunawiwāha (1938a). For the sake of explication I shall divide his complex argument into two phases and discuss each in turn.

The first phase may be called, as we have already briefly discussed, an "allegorical reading". In this phase a parallelism is established between the story represented in a narrative and socio-historical reality, in this instance, between the Arjunawiwāha and the life story of Airlangga. The life of this king is well recorded—a rare incident in ancient Javanese history—on the so-called Calcutta stone inscription dated AD 1041. According to the inscription, after the downfall in 1016, called pralaya in the record, of the Eastern Javanese kingdom founded by the king Siṅcqok, the young prince Airlangga escaped the palace with his small entourage and took refuge in a hermitage on Mount Wanagiri. Later he was visited by dignitaries and Brahmans, who pleaded with him to accept the royal power as successor of his father-in-law, who had died in the downfall. He was officially crowned in 1019 but it took a series of campaigns between 1028 and 1035 to unify the disintegrated kingdom. In 1041, a few years before his death, the king built a temple in Pucangan, where the inscription that recorded this information about the king was elected (Krom 1931: 239–71). It was during the reign of this king and under his patronage that the poet Kāṇḍwa composed the Arjunawiwāha kakawin.50 This kakawin draws on an episode telling of the deeds of Arjuna, hero of the Pāṇḍava brothers, in the Indian epic Mahābhārata. Arjuna, who meditates on Mount Indrakīla, is tested by the god Indra to determine the extent of his steadfastness and the real purpose of his penance. After having successfully passed the test, he encounters the god Siwa, who grants him a magic arrow as favour. Then he is asked by Indra to kill the demon king Niwātakawaca, who has an intention of destroying the heaven. Arjuna accomplishes the task with the help of nymph Suprabhā. As reward, he is crowned as king on Indra’s throne and stays in the heaven for seven months, enjoying nuptial bliss with seven celestial nymphs, before returning

50 The kakawin might have be composed during the time of Airlangga’s campaigns between 1028 and 1035 (Zoetmulder 1974: 244).
to earth to rejoin his brothers. Undeniably there is a similar pattern between the life-
story of Airlangga and the deed of Arjuna. Both heroes meditate on an isolated
mountain, wage campaigns, finally gain the victory over an enemy, and then are
crowned as kings and marry. Even when there are deviations on the Arjunawiwāha’s
side from the Mahābhārata story, the necessary adjustment to achieve the identification
seems to account for the deviations. Berg, struck by this nearly perfect parallelism,
declared that “the story of the Arjunawiwāha is Airlangga’s life-story transposed into
epic form” (Berg 1938a: 41).

Robson has extended the application of the notion of an “allegorical reading” of
the Arjunawiwāha to kakawin literature in general (1983). He argues that in Old
Javanese terminology “kakawin” denotes a stanza consisting of four metrical lines,
whereas “palambang” is the literary genre comprising poetical works in kakawin form.
From a suggested relation of the word “palambang” with a Modern Javanese word
“pralambang”, which means “secret or deep reference, allusion” and is sometimes
translated with ‘prophecy’, although ‘allegory’ might be a better term”, Robson has
proposed that “the Old Javanese poem called palambang may be an allegory or contain
hidden allusions” and showed several instances in which “allegorical reading” can
established by the corroborations of other sources (1983: 301–2). The notion of “secret
reference”, “allegory” whose real meaning can be understood only by those who share
the secret knowledge, also occupies the central part of Berg’s methodology. If
Robson’s argument is right, Berg’s way of understanding kakawin literature is not the
external imposition of modern interpretation on ancient literature but is in accordance
with the Old Javanese perception of kakawin literature.

However, what makes Berg’s theory distinctive is its second phase, which
may be called the theory of “literary magic”, which not simply makes of the
identification of Airlangga with Arjuna a poetical panegyric but establishes a magical
relationship between the two figures. According to Berg the court poet was a “priest of
literary magic” who exerted influence on the social situation by composing kakawin
imbued with magical power. The poet chose relevant stories from the Indian literary
tradition not necessarily for their aesthetic value but for their relevance to the socio-
historical context so that the story could be read as an allegory by the knowledgeable
reader. If necessary, the poet did not hesitate to alter the story from the Indian original
to adjust it to the Javanese context. Through the implicit allusions to historical and
contemporary events and verbal magic inherent in the poem, the literary magic of
kakawin would enhance the king’s quality of being unconquerable, wise and
benevolent (Berg 1938b).51 It is in this context that Berg also conjectures that the
episode of Arjuna’s heavenly wedding in the Arjunawiwāha, but absent in the
Mahābhārata, is actually the wedding of king Airlangga with a Sumatran princess
(Berg 1938a: 64–75), despite the fact that this is not specifically mentioned in the
Calcutta inscription. The poet’s intention of composing the kakawin, as Berg sees it, is
that the magical power “inherent in the story, and in the words chosen by the poet to
recount it” would communicate “itself to the royal couple so as to make their union a
prosperous one” (Zoetmulder 1974: 168). Thus, combined with the first phase, Berg’s
argument is that the narrative content of the Arjunawiwāha and certain other kakawin
works are the “allegory” of historical events and that their social function was to
influence through “literary magic” the Javanese social situation.

It may be sensible to treat the two phases separately and not go too far with
Berg’s second phase, for we simply do not have enough evidence either to concede or
deny it. The notion of “literary magic” does provide us with valuable help to
understand passages in kakawin, for, as Zoetmulder says, “there was unquestionably
a wide-spread belief in the extraordinary power of words in ancient Java, and it would
be unwise not to take this into account when trying to understand Old Javanese culture
and literature” (1974: 169).52 However, it is questionable whether we should

51 See Zoetmulder (1957: 59–60; 1974: 168–70) for the summary of Berg’s
conclusion.

52 Zoetmulder gives several instances where the notion of “literary magic”
helps us to understand some passages in kakawin (1974: 168–9).
presume, whenever we find “allegorical” elements in *kakawin*, that the author’s
intention was to conduct “literary magic” through the composition of *kakawin*.\(^\text{53}\)

A more important and workable way of understanding the “allegorical” mode
of reading as the social function of *kakawin* is to explore the possibility that a *kakawin*
narrative might be a poet’s comment on socio-historical reality within the horizon of
expectations of the *kakawin* genre. For instance, in the Sutasoma *kakawin* the author
sets the story in *kaliyuga*, the age of destruction. This may not be merely a literary
convention but an author’s conscious choice to make the narrative relevant to the
contemporary situation. Not only the setting but also the choice of plot and character
for the narrative cannot be completely free from such referentiality, though these
elements should satisfy the horizon of expectation. In this sense, *kakawin* literature
can be seen as a narrative mode of interpretation of historical reality by the poet.
However, to consider *kakawin* literature as a poet’s comment does not necessarily
mean that we are obliged to see, as Berg does, the entire narrative of a *kakawin* text is
an “allegory” of historical events, unless we have substantial evidence from other
sources to support the view. “Allegorical” reference also does not have to mean
coherent and systematic parallelism between narrative and reality. Instead it may
consist of various levels of reference to the socio-historical reality embedded in
different aspects of a narrative. Whether this referentiality actually had, or was
intended to have, “magical” influence on the course of the history of ancient Javanese
society is another matter.

From this review of Old Javanese studies a number of different approaches
emerge. Each approach taken by various scholars throws light on particular aspects of
*kakawin* literature, or literary functions of the horizon of expectation. It appears that

\(^{53}\) In this context we may also pay attention to Day’s remark that “the
absence of a tradition of panegyric inscriptions and poetry undermines Berg’s
influential view that there is a simple, direct, ‘magical’ relationship between poetic
writing and the glorification or legitimation of kings in Java” (1981: 66).
the approach Hooykaas and others have taken is concerned firstly with the modus
dicendi, in particular, prosody and embellishment, and secondly with the function of
unities of the represented, in particular, action and characters. The scholars who take
this approach also draw attention to the fact that significantly these aspects are
derivative of classical Indian poetics. This does not mean that the approach should be
dismissed entirely as the imposition of a foreign poetics on Javanese literature, for
once an aspect is incorporated into the horizon of expectation it is functionally
inseparable with other aspects regardless of its origin. By contrast the approach taken
by Poerbatjaraka and others, which works mostly on subject matter, that is, the
function of unities of the represented, stresses Javanese tradition in *kakawin* literature.
Although the origin of subject matter and character which the two approaches
emphasize may be different, if these elements are understood as constituent parts of the
horizon of expectation of *kakawin* literature, then it is possible to see the *kakawin*
genre as a coherent unity. In other words, these approaches address the question of
intertextuality, in which what matters is not so much the original source as the relation
between texts. Both Zoetmulder and Berg take another approach which examines the
modus recipiendi and the social function of *kakawin* literature, a link between the
represented of the text and the extratextual reality. Zoetmulder considers *kakawin*
literature as "belletristic" and limits its social function within literary circles. Berg on
the other hand demonstrates the political and religious implications in *kakawin*
literature. Although his notion of "literary magic" may not be accepted unconditionally,
an attraction of his approach is that the notion of "allegorical" reading rightly addresses
the fact that a *kakawin* is not merely a poem but a narrative poem.
CHAPTER THREE
THE UNITY OF THE REPRESENTED WORLD

The Sutasoma *kakawin*, as a narrative, provides the audience with its story which unfolds a represented world, a spatial and temporal environment with the characters living and the events occurring in it. These textual elements, spatio-temporal setting, characters and events, are all correlated and organized in the narrative in such a way that the story they constitute fits in with the horizon of expectation with which the audience encounter the narrative. In addition, the spatial and temporal settings provide the horizon of expectation with the framework in which *kakawin* works are ordered in a coherent manner. In this chapter I shall examine the principles, or codes, which achieve what Jauss calls the "unities of the represented" in the narrative, in particular the spatial and temporal settings, for they appear to me to provide the most pertinent foundation for the discussion not only of the characters and the events situated in the setting but also of the religious and political aspects of the narrative which will be dealt with in the following chapters.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, one of the main factors which give the epic character to *kakawin* literature is the narratological distance between what is narrated and the act of narration. Bakhtin aptly describes one of the characteristics of the epic as a genre being cut off from the present. Clark and Holquist summarise his ideas as follows:

The time of epic is not chronological; it is rather a world of beginnings and peak times in the national history, a world of firsts and bests. Epics are not simply set in a time that has receded, for epic time is best perceived as a value. What was in the past is automatically considered to be better, bigger, stronger, or more beautiful. In epic, someone is speaking about a past that is to him inaccessible, and he adopts the reverent point of view of
a descendant. In its style, tone, and manner of expression, epic discourse is far removed from the discourse of a contemporary addressed to other contemporaries. Even though both its singer and its implied listener are located in the same time and value system, the represented world stands on an utterly different and inaccessible time and value plane, separated by epic distance. (Clark and Holquist 1984: 287)

In *kakawin* literature in general “epic distance” is achieved by setting the space of the story in “India” and the time of the story in the past within the framework of the four *yuga* system, although the “Indian-ness” of the narrative, we should notice, is not at all referred to Indian India but to “India” as perceived by ancient Javanese society.

However, in the narrative of Sutasoma, there is a tension in the workings of the spatial and temporal settings. While the location of the story is set in “India” like the most of other *kakawin* narratives, the time of the story is set in the present age of *kaliyuga*, although the story time is still in the past in relation to the time where the author and audience live. Thus there are two polarized forces: “epic distance” and what we may call “localization” in the narrative. The effect of “localization” is not confined to the temporal setting but is found in many aspects of the spatial setting. Despite the abundance of Indian toponyms in the spatial setting, a close examination of the setting will reveal evidence of “localization”. Although the “localization” of the spatial setting is not unique to the Sutasoma but found to a varying degree in other *kakawin* narratives, the “localization” of the temporal setting is confined to the Sutasoma and a few other *kakawin* from the Majapahit period. I shall argue later that in the Sutasoma narrative the “localization” of the story indicates the transitional nature of the Sutasoma between the *kakawin* literature and the *kidung* literature and that the “localization” also allows the author to cast his narrative as a model for the contemporary audience.

**Spatial Setting**

The spatial setting of the Sutasoma narrative is explicitly set in “India” at the beginning of the narrative:
1.5 There in the excellent capital of Hastina, śri Mahāketu, a descendant of the Kuru race, ruled securely over all the great heroes, . . .

The “Indian-ness” of the spatial setting determines the nature of the narrative. It first of all establishes the narrated world in distant “India”. But in analyzing a narrative the process of signification should be dealt with carefully. When the spatial setting is embedded in a narrative, space is inevitably concretized by the process. But the process is also one of symbolization. The two processes are not contradictory, for the concretization is realized in the narrative not through the reference to the extratextual reality, but to other texts. In the following sections in which the spatial setting is subdivided into three levels: toponyms, cosmography and landscape, I shall investigate the nature of the spatial setting at each level. The investigation will give us an insight into the actual working of intertextual signification and the tension between “Indian-ness” and “localization”.

Toponyms in the Sutasoma Narrative

The Sutasoma narrative is suffused with Indian toponyms, as is already evident in stanza 1.5 quoted above. The city mentioned in this stanza, Hastina, also known as Hastinapura or Hastināpura in Sanskrit, was, according to an Indian tradition, founded by Hastin, son of Bharata, the ancestor of the Bhārata clan, and hence its name.1 The city plays a key role in the Mahābhārata story (Zoetmulder 1974: 71–81). When the rivalry between the two branches of the Bhārata clan, Pāṇḍawa and Korawa, became so tense, to avoid open confrontation, the kingdom was divided into two, with the Korawa reigning in Hastina and the Pāṇḍawa in Indraprastha.2

---

1 In this section most information about Indian tradition is based on Dowson (1982).

2 Interestingly, the Pāṇḍawa’s capital is known as Amarta in Javanese wayang tradition (Brandon 1970: 12).
end the battle broke out and resulted in the victory of Pāṇḍava, who then reigned in Hastina. Since then, that is, in the post-Mahābhārata era, Hastina has become the capital of the descendants of Arjuna, one the five Pāṇḍava brothers.

In this connection it is interesting to point out that although the link between Hastina and the descendants of the Pāṇḍava was clearly established in Javanese literary tradition, the patrilineal lineage of Sutasoma is sometimes called the clan of Kuru, the term usually reserved for the Korawa. The anomaly between toponym and genealogy may be explained by the fact that in the Indian tradition Kuru is an ancient prince of the Lunar race (Candravāśa), an ancestor of both Pāṇḍava and Korawa. Therefore, although the patronymic term “clan of Kuru” is customarily applied to the Korawa, it appears that in the Sutasoma narrative the term actually denotes any descendant of Kuru, including that of Pāṇḍava. Sutasoma’s lineage, then, enables the narrative Sutasoma to situate itself in the mainstream of the Indian epic tradition.

---

3 The patrilineal lineage of Sutasoma is named according to its patriarch’s names. It is, on the one hand, called the descendant of Kuru (Kurukula, 1.5, 64.3, 70.2, 126.8), the lineage of the king of the Kuru (Kurunātha-wangśa, 18.2), and even the lineage of the Korawa (Korawāngśa, 1.5). On the other hand, however, it is also called the descendant of Bharata (Bharatāngśa, 15.3, 30.10, 31.10, 72.4), the Bharata clan (Bharata-kula, 26.2, 35.1), the lineage of Bharata (Bhārata-wangśa, 57.13, 71.3).

4 The ambiguous status of Sutasoma’s lineage may be intentional. It may have its cause in a contradiction in the literary discourse. Some of the Indian versions of the Sutasoma story (Mahāsutasoma-jātaka and Jātakamāla no. 31), which seem to be a literary source of the Old Javanese version, say that the hero Sutasoma is a prince of Kuru clan. This must have troubled Tantular, who worked in the kakawin convention in which the Kuru clan is the chief antagonist. The ambiguity of definition of Korawa and Bharata may have been deliberately employed by the author to be able to shift Sutasoma’s lineage from the descendant of Korawa to that of Pāṇḍava. The manipulation seems to be successful in creating a new horizon of expectation, for in a later Old Javanese prose rendition found in the Cantakaparwa, Sutasoma is categorically described as the great-grandson of the Hastina king called Pāṇḍava (Ensink 1967: 59–60).
The link between the toponym and the genealogy is again established in stanza 54.14, where the realm of the known world is designated as “Bhāratabhūmimandala” (The territory of the Bhārata). Although Zoetmulder’s dictionary gives the meaning “the territory of the country of king Mahāketu (descendant of Bharata)” (1982: 216), the events which follow the mention of Bhāratabhūmimandala, in which Sutasoma encounters Daśabāhu and so on, suggests rather this term may well denote the known world, one which the audience would have understood as “India”, for in the Indian tradition, this known, and therefore to a varying extent domesticated, world is defined as the terrain where the Bhārata performed their deeds.

In addition to Hastina, most kingdoms of the kings allied to Sutasoma, such as Kāśi, Dwārawati, Kuṇḍina and Cedi, are also of Indian origin. Firstly, the kingdom of Kāśi is ruled by Daśabāhu, whose importance in the story is second only to Sutasoma and Poruṣāda, for he is Sutasoma’s cousin and Sutasoma’s father’s ally against the demons and later becomes Sutasoma’s brother-in-law and commander-in-chief. In Indian tradition the city of Kāśi is a celebrated city on the river Ganges, counted as one of the seven sacred cities along with Ayodhyā, Mathurā, Māyā, Kāñci, Awantī and Dwārawati. Then, Dwārawati, the city of gates, is a city located in Gujarat. According to Indian tradition the city is said to be Krṣṇa’s capital, which was submerged by the ocean seven days after his death. The Sutasoma narrative, however, apparently overlooked this tradition, for stanza 117.6 states that the city is ruled by King Citrāngsuka. Finally, Kuṇḍina is, according to Indian tradition, the capital of the Widarbhā, situated in the present Bihar. In the narrative the king of Widarbhā appears as one of the hundred kings captured for sacrifice by Poruṣāda (108.1–110.13). Later the name of Kuṇḍina is mentioned as a kingdom ruled by King Susena, one of the Sutasoma’s allies, who stands ready to fight against the demons.
(117.12). No attempt, however, is made to establish a link between Widarbha and 
Kunḍina in the narrative.5

It is significant in this context that in the narrative demons are generally 
deprived of their indigenous lands. They are either inhabitants of nobody’s lands or 
intruders in human kingdoms. In other words, not belonging to this known world, 
they are “aliens” in the narrative. Even Poruṣāda’s capital city Ratnanaḍa, although a 
Sanskrit name, is a toponym of no literary significance either in Indian or Javanese 
tradition.6 In contrast to this are the kingdoms of the three human kings who declare 
themselves loyal subjects of Poruṣāda. All three kingdoms, Awangga, Kalingga and 
Magadha, are known in Indian history. The kingdom of Awangga, known in Sanskrit 
literature as Anga, is said to be the kingdom of Karṇa, half-brother of the Pāṇḍawa, 
and corresponds to the modern Bhāgalpur in Bengal. According to Indian tradition the 
country lies to the east of Magadha and either to the north-east or to the south-east of 
Mithilā. Kalingga and Magadha are situated, according to Indian tradition, on the 
Coromandel coast, north of Madras, and in the southern part of Bihar respectively.

5 The range of the topographic reference to “India” is also well expressed in 
a passage from 95.15. The passage states that upon the attack by the demons, “the 
kings of Kamboja, Ayodhya and Mithilā had already been captured and the kings of 
Lēṅkā, Kaśmir and Walabha had fled. All the people in their capital cities were in 
confusion.” These toponyms are all historically known place names. Kamboja is the 
country of a race of the same name living to the north-east of India. Ayodhya, one of 
the seven sacred cities and famous as the capital city of Rāma, is said to be situated on 
the river Saryū in the modern Oudh. Mithilā, the capital of the country called Wideha, 
is located in North Bihār, which corresponds to the modern Tirhut and Puraniya, 
between the Gandakī and Kośī rivers. Lēṅkā and Kaśmir correspond to the modern 
Sri Langkā and Kashmir. Lēṅkā is well-known as the kingdom of Rāma’s demonic 
opponent Raṅaṇa. Walabha, Valabhi or Valabhi in Sanskrit, is known as the name of 
a town in Saurāṣṭra. The apparently incoherent use of these Indian toponyms strongly 
suggests that they are employed only to evoke “Indian-ness” in the narrative.

6 This appears to be a general tendency in kakawin literature. There are, 
however, a few notable exceptions, in particular the demon king Raṅaṇa, who reigns 
in Lēṅkā in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Arjunawijaya.
In the Sutasoma narrative these three kingdoms are ruled by three human kings: Awangga by Dewântaka, Kalingga by Sulabha and Magadha by Kośa. Interestingly, when their names are mentioned in the narrative, they appear in close association to each other (112.12, 113.1-6). This is no coincidence, since two of the three, Dewântaka and Kośa, are said to be brothers. The relation between the two brothers and Sulabha is never made explicit in the narrative. However, the later rendering of the Sutasoma story in the Cantakaparwa tells that the kings of the three kingdoms are all related as brothers, although their names are not any more the same as those of the Sutasoma kakawin (Ensink 1967: 9, note 27). Their correlation may be further explained with respect to other works of the kakawin genre. We learn from the Bhomântaka, or Bhomakâwa, a kakawin by an unknown author from the Kâcli period, that the kings of Magadha, Awangga and Kalingga as well as Cedi are allied with the demon king Bhoma in the fight against Kṛṣṇa (Zoetmulder 1974: 317). In Indian tradition the theme of the war between Kṛṣṇa and Bhauma, as Bhoma is spelt in Sanskrit, and the eventual death of the latter at the hands of the former is well established in the Kṛṣṇa cycle, which in turn forms part of the complex Mahābhārata cycle.

The king of Magadha, Jarâsandha, is an eminent opponent of Kṛṣṇa in this great Mahābhārata cycle. Therefore, the king of Magadha would make a natural ally of the demon king. How the alliance of the king of Magadha with the kings of Awangga and Kalingga came about is not clear, but the juxtaposition of these names in the Bhomântaka may have well influenced the narrative of the Sutasoma. As Zoetmulder points out, it appears that Tantular, the author of the Sutasoma, knew the story of Bhoma, for stanza 132.4 states that the demon king Poruṣâda is “like king Bhūmiputra [son of the earth, Bhūmi, i.e. Bhoma] meeting the fury of Sâmbha and Pâñcûpûtra [son of Pânḍu]”. The mention of Arjuna, described as the son of Pânḍu in this passage and an opponent of Bhoma, corresponds with the story narrated in the Bhomântaka (Zoetmulder 1974: 321). The same juxtaposition of the three kings is also found in Tantular’s earlier kakawin Arjunawijaya, but curiously in this narrative the
kings are allied with the hero Arjuna Sahasrabâhu instead of with the demon king Râwâna.

It should be clear by now that the function of these Indian toponyms in the narrative is the signification not of a specific extratextual reality but of a literary image of “India” as perceived by ancient Javanese, which links the narrative intertextually with other narratives which are also filled with “Indian-ness”. This mode of signification of “Indian-ness” is also underlined by the fact that the use of the names of characters is relatively free from constraint of toponymic significance in Indian literary tradition. As we have seen, we can not find in Indian tradition the name of king Mahâketu who is said to be the ruler of Hastina in the narrative. Thus, as a rule, although the name of a kingdom in the narrative originates from Indian literary tradition, the name of the king who rules the kingdom does not correspond to the one found in Indian tradition. This discrepancy may have been justified in the poet’s mind by the fact that the yuga period of the narrative was not the same any more as the yuga periods generally found Indian tradition.

The fact that “Indian-ness” is an integral part of the horizon of expectation of the kakawin literature becomes even clearer when we consider the spatial and temporal setting of a later literary genre, kidung. Zoetmulder remarks on the setting of kidung literature that “most of the stories are set in and around some kraton in Java” and, what is more interesting, that “it seems that it was the Balinese kraton which served the authors as model” (Zoetmulder 1974: 408). A quick survey of the major toponyms in some kidung will suffice to support the remark. There are a group of historical kidung, such as Harsawijaya, Rangga Lawe, Sorândaka and Kidung Sunda, which narrate the stories of the fall of Singhasari, the foundation of Majapahit and subsequent internal struggles. These stories are set in the topographical realm of Java, particularly in and around Majapahit. Another group of kidung, such as Waseng Sari, Wangbang Wideya and Malat, tell the story of the amorous adventures of the prince of Koripan, commonly known as Pâñji, and of his love for the princess of Daha. According to the Waseng Sari, for example, there are four kingdoms ruled by kings who are related as
brothers. These are Koripan, Daha, Gêgêlang and Singhasari. While the last name is the name of a well-known East Javanese kingdom, the first three names have been also identified as historical kingdoms in Javanese history: Koripan as Janggala, Daha as Kaçîri and Gêgêlang as Urawan. Zoetmulder has made a point that in kidung literature "the kratons are not those of Hâstina or Dwârawati, but of Kaçîri, Janggala, Gêgêlang and many others, including even Sêmarang and Kartasura (a kraton founded in 1681)" (1974: 428). Thus, contrary to the kakawin literature, in the kidung literature the effort to link the narrative with the "Indian-ness" in terms of spatial setting has been completely abandoned.

Cosmography in the Sutasoma Narrative

Having looked into the use of particular toponyms, we shall now move to a more general framework, cosmography, which points to clear, albeit subtle, evidence of Javanization in the Sutasoma narrative. In Indian cosmography the key concept that determines the shape of the configuration of the world is dwipa (island continent). According to Sircar, Hindu cosmography evolved from the earlier four dwipa system to the later seven dwipa system, while Buddhist cosmography represents a transitional system (1967: 38). In the four dwipa system, which appears as early as the Mahâbhârata, the earth consists of four dwipa which resemble four petals of a lotus flower. In the centre Mount Meru is situated as the pivot of the earth like the pericarp of the lotus flower. The four dwipa to the east, south, west and north of Meru are called respectively Bhadrâśva, Bhârata (or Jambudwipa), Ketumâla and Kuru. The allusion to the lotus flower signifies the creation myth in which the creator Brahmâ emerges from a cosmic lotus stemming from Wiñu's navel (Sircar 1967: 40). By contrast the seven dwipa system, which had become more popular in purâña literature, enumerates seven concentric dwipa. The central dwipa, where Mount Meru is situated, is circular in shape and is called Jambudwipa, whereas the other six are ring-shaped, each separated from others by the seas (Sircar 1967: 47). Sircar also asserts that a typical Buddhist world system represents a transition between the four
and seven \textit{dwipa} systems. In this world system the earth consists of four \textit{dwipa} circling Mount Meru like the four \textit{dwipa} system, but Meru in turn is surrounded by seven concentric annular mountain ranges like the seven \textit{dwipa} system, which, according to Sircar, may have become the seven \textit{dwipa} in a later stage (1967: 38–9).

The continent which people inhabit is Jambudwipa, the southernmost in the four \textit{dwipa} and Buddhist systems and the innermost in the seven \textit{dwipa} system. An interesting difference between the two systems is that in the former Mount Meru is separated by the sea from the four \textit{dwipa} while in the latter Meru is located in the centre of Jambudwipa. This leads us to a conclusion that the author of the Sutasoma narrative used the seven \textit{dwipa} system, for the hero Sutasoma reaches Mount Meru by land in about seven days. This suggests that despite its strong Buddhist characteristics at the religious level the narrative at the story level is constrained by the \textit{kakawin} literary convention, which is closely related to the mainstream Hindu tradition.\footnote{The \textquotedblleft \textit{dwipa}\textquotedblright{} in the four and seven \textit{dwipa} systems should not be confused with the geographical notion of \textquotedblleft Yawadwipa\textquotedblright{}, the designation normally used in Old Javanese literature for the island of Java (Zoetmulder 1982: 2361), as in, for instance, the Hariwangsa, which recounts that \textit{Wisnu} is reincarnated in Yawadwipa as king Jaya\textit{s}atu (53.2). The \textit{VAYu Pur\ARC{s}a} (48.11–14), after describing islands in the ocean to the south of Bh\ioc{a}rata\textit{war\ARC{s}a}, states that around Jambudwipa there are six \textit{dwipa} called \textit{Anga}, Yama, Malaya, \textit{\u{S}arkha}, Ku\textit{s}a and Var\textit{\u{a}}ha (Tagare 1987: 311, Sircar 1967: 66). These \textquotedblleft lesser\textquotedblright{} \textit{dwipa} are remote localities, whether islands or part of a continent, conceptualized in the Indian mind as satellite countries around India, with which communication was established by sea rather by land. It may be conjectured that the geographical notion of Yawadwipa was understood in this sense in ancient Javanese society.}

According to the seven \textit{dwipa} system, Jambudwipa is subdivided into \textit{war\ARC{s}a} (regional zone), which are usually seven in number (Sircar 1967: 52). Each \textit{war\ARC{s}a} runs across the continent from the eastern to western coast like a strip, except for the southernmost Bh\ioc{a}rata\textit{war\ARC{s}a} and the northernmost Uttar\textit{ku}r\textit{u}war\ARC{s}a which are said to be bow-shaped because of their semi-circular form. The \textit{war\ARC{s}a} are separated from one another by six dividing mountain ranges (\textit{war\ARC{s}apar\ARC{w}ata}), which form such impassable
natural barriers that the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa (15.27–31) declares that “it was impossible to travel from one Varṣa to another” (Tagare 1983: 144). Among the seven warṣa it is Bhāratawarṣa that appears to be the Indian subcontinent, for it is described as semi-circular in shape and situated between the Himālaya mountain to the north and the ocean to the south (Sircar 1967: 54). This is the area which was actually known to ancient Indian people. In a passage of the Sutasoma narrative (54.14) the profane world to which Sutasoma returns after his meditation on the sacred Meru is called “Bhāratabhūmimaṇḍala”. This term should be understood in the context of Indian cosmography. Thus, it does not primarily signify the actual territory ruled by the Bhārata but rather the world known to and inhabited by humans.8

While the concept of dwipa in the Sutasoma appears to comply with Indian cosmology, the location of Mount Meru in the narrative gives an important insight into the deviation from Indian cosmology. In Indian cosmography Mount Meru is always regarded as the centre of the universe. Thus, in the seven dwipa system Mount Meru is located in Jámbudvīpa, the central warṣa of Jambudvīpa. This means that Meru is located to the north of Bhāratawarṣa, the human world, and that if one ever wishes to reach Meru he has to travel northward, traversing two mountain ranges, the first of which is the Himālaya, and one warṣa between the ranges before reaching Jámbudvīpa, where Meru is located. In this context, it is quite remarkable that in the Sutasoma narrative Mount Meru is described as being located to the south of the human world, Bhāratabhūmimaṇḍala. When the hero Sutasoma deserts the palace and princely life to seek the attainment of spiritual fulfillment he sets out towards south. Stanza 7.4 recounts that “he went away far to the south as though departing secretly to hide”. As he continues his journey, Sutasoma comes to a mountainous area, where he receives advice from a goddess to proceed to Mount Meru in order to achieve

---

8 It seems to me that Zoetmulder’s definition of the term “the territory of the country of king Mahāketu” is too narrow (1982: 216). It does not account for the existence of kingdoms other than Hastina, the kingdom of Mahāketu.
his objective. After travelling for seven days, he reaches the sage Keśawa’s hermitage, which is located in the vicinity of Meru, for it is said that the mountain is in sight from the hermitage (13.6). As he approaches the mountain, when Sutasoma has to pass by a great kēpuh tree in terrifying ravines, Keśawa, who has decided to escort Sutasoma to the mountain, warns Sutasoma that he should “take the path right across the slopes on the narrow southern pass” to avoid the tree, because it is infested by a savage elephant-headed monster (29.12). These are subtle but significant indications that the location of Mount Meru is to the south of the known world and not to the north as it is expected from the Indian cosmography.

The deviation of the location of Mount Meru may be accounted for, firstly, by the geographical situation of the kingdom of Majapahit in which the Sutasoma narrative was composed. The kingdom was located to the south of the Java Sea on the one hand and to the north of the mountain range on the other hand. Therefore if the Majapahit reader was to conceive any mountain on the island of Java representing the centre of the world, it must have been located to the south of the kingdom. However, more importantly, the deviation may be accounted for by the fact that within the horizon of expectation the location of Mount Meru was established on the island of Java. In fact the story of the transfer of Mount Meru from India to Java is found in various Old Javanese works. The Tantu Panggêlaran, for instance, recounts that:

Bhaṭāra Guru [that is, Śiwa] gave orders to all deities to move Mount Mahāmeru from India to Java, so that the island of Java would stop swaying up and down. After many efforts and hardships, which included the death of the gods and their restoration to life by Guru, the peak of the Mountain was eventually brought to Java, so that island of Java ceased moving.9

9 This summary of the story is taken from Supomo (1977: 75). The text of the Tantu Panggêlaran is published by Pigeaud (1924).
Although the text, whose terminus ante quem is AD 1635, is younger than the Sutasoma, the story may have originated from an earlier period (Supomo 1977: 76). In any case, the reference to Mount Meru in the Sutasoma narrative indicates a change of Javanese cosmology from the old one based on Indian cosmology to the new cosmology which situated the island of Java in the centre.

The significance of Mount Meru, however, is derived not only from its status as the geographical centre of the world to be used as a point of reference but as symbolic space. Therefore the transfer of Meru is that of a symbolic space to Java. As Mabbett asserts, the mountain is associated with "the many layers of symbolism that exchange Meru for the cosmic man, for the temple at the centre of the universe, for the office of kingship, for the stūpa, for the mandala, and for the internal ascent undertaken by the tantric mystic" (1983: 66). Thus, "to approach Meru is to change one's spiritual state; to arrive at the top is to transcend particularities of state altogether" (Mabbett 1983: 68). It is this symbolic signification of Meru that conditions the horizon of expectation.

The symbolic significance of Meru had already become part of the horizon of expectation in Old Javanese literature, when the Sutasoma was composed in the fourteenth century. The kakawin Smaradahana, written in the late twelfth century, gives Mount Meru special weight by describing it as the place where Śiva performs severe penance. Although in Indian tradition Mount Meru is not considered to be the place for Śiva's penance, in Javanese literary tradition the connection between the god

---

10 The relation between the gradual change of the hero's spiritual state and the progression of the hero in the story space is one of the most important aspects of Bakhtin's notion of chronotope. We shall discuss the issue in the next chapter.

11 It is interesting to note that Mabbett gives attention to the prominence of Mount Meru in Southeast Asia in general, observing the fact that in Southeast Asian tradition Mount Meru often replaces Mount Mandara in Indian tradition as the mountain with which the gods churn the ocean of milk (1983: 71).
and the mountain appears to have been established since the Smaradahana. In the Sutasoma there are three allusions to Mount Meru as the place for Śiwa’s penance. The goddess Widyutkarāli appears before Sutasoma, who has just fled from the palace but has not yet decided where to perform asceticism, and advises Sutasoma that he is destined to go to “the supreme king of mountains, Sumeru, the hermitage of god Guru [bhaṭāra Guru, namely Śiwa], where he became the perfect king of the yogins [yogīśvara]” (12.3). Afterwards when Sutasoma meets the sage Keśawa on the way to the mountain, he explains to the sage that he wishes to see the cave in Mount Meru, where Ghoripati, that is Śiwa, performed penance (16.3). Later another sage also mentions Mount Meru as the place where Rudra (the fierce aspect of Śiwa) performed penance (28.7).

The notion of Meru as the place for penance is also found in later kakawin. The Pārthayajña, an elaboration of an episode from the Mahābhārata, recounts Arjuna’s penance on Mount Indrakīla, which the narrative describes as part of Mount Sumeru (Zoetmulder 1974: 370). In the Kuṇjarakarna the two yakṣa Kuṇjarakarna and Pūrṇawijaya perform Buddhist asceticism on Mount Sumeru (Zoetmulder 1974: 375, 367-71).

12 Kālidāsa’s Kumārasambhava, which may have influenced the Smaradahana (Zoetmulder 1974: 297-8), sets the place of Śiwa’s penance on Mount Himālaya (Wilson 1966). However, both in Indian and Javanese traditions Śiwa’s abode is usually located at the summit of Mount Kailāsa, where he is engaged in coitus with his consort Umā. In Old Javanese literature the mention of Mount Kailāsa as Śiwa’s abode is found in the epilogue of the Ādiparwa and the stories of the Uttarākanda, Arjunawijaya and Kuṇjarakarna (Zoetmulder 1974: 84, 99, 326, 361). In this respect it is remarkable that between Tantular’s two works, Arjunawijaya and Sutasoma kakawin, Śiwa’s abode shifts from Mount Kailāsa to Mount Meru. This may reflect the change of emphasis on Śiwa’s sexual indulgence with his consort Umā on Mount Kailāsa to his solitary, asexual meditation on Mount Meru.

13 In Indian tradition Mount Indrakīla is a mountain located to the south of Himālaya (Mani 1975: 330). For the story of the Pārthayajña, see Zoetmulder (1974: 367-71).
Although in these two *kakawin* the characters who perform penance are not Śiwa himself, the connection with the god is unmistakable. In the Pārthayajña the god appears before Arjuna and grants him a favour as the reward for his penance, while in the Kuñjarakarna devotion to Buddha appears to be no different from that to Śiwa, for the narrative advocates the identification of the two in a speech of Wairocana.

Sutasoma's journey to and meditation in the cave on Mount Meru should be understood within this aspect of the horizon of expectation. The summit of the mountain is the space sanctified either by Śiwa's performance of penance or by his manifestation before a human who performs penance on the mountain. Sutasoma's transformation into Wairocana on Mount Meru then anticipates, through the intertextual reference to the horizon of expectation, the identification of Buddha and Śiwa disclosed by the gods later in the narrative. The religious aspect of the narrative will be dealt with in detail in the following chapter, but it should be reiterated here that the reference to Mount Meru in the Sutasoma is indicative of the emergence of the new horizon of expectation in which Indian concepts came to be used in the increasingly Javanized context.

**Landscape in the Sutasoma Narrative**

The Javanization of the spatial setting in *kakawin* literature is also achieved through the description of flora and fauna in the narrative. Zoetmulder observes that "the vegetable and animal world of the *kakawins* is predominantly Javanese" (1974: 196). A typical example is taken by him from the Old Javanese *Rāmāyana*. At the beginning of the sarga eight, Hanumān goes on a reconnaissance journey through the

---

14 The dates of origin of the *kakawin* Kuñjarakarna and Pārthayajña are not established, but their stories must have been known at the latest in the Singhasari period, for the stories are represented in a series of relief panels on Caṇḍi Jago (Zoetmulder 1974: 372–4). For the story of the Kuñjarakarna, see Zoetmulder (1974: 374–8).
air to Lēngkā. He breaks his journey upon Mount Menakā’s invitation to rest on its top:

Mount Menakā receives Hanūmān, out on his spying mission, with great hospitality and presents to him: jambu duryan poh manggis kacapi limo limus kapundung langseb duwet (RY 8.10). It does not seem likely that all these fruits, some of which are typically Indonesian, would have grown well on an Indian mountain. (Zoetmulder 1974: 196)

In this particular context the Javanization of the fruits is most appropriate. If the original but alien Indian names of fruit were used, they would convey the signification of “Indian-ness”, but they certainly would fail to achieve the signification of “hospitality”, which is exactly what is called for in this situation. Only the Indonesian names of fruit can evoke the desired reaction from the reader. Thus, the use of the Javanized plant names in the narrative is, in general, not so much to refer to the real plants in the the natural environment as to achieve the symbolic signification in the reader’s perception.

_Kakawin_ literature employs flora in its narrative in two ways. A plant name is used firstly as an element in a particular landscape and secondly as a figurative word to which a subject is compared. This distinction can be sometimes obscured when, for instance, a plant in a spatial setting serves at the same time as a vehicle of figurative expression. Our primary concern here, however, is how plants are situated in various landscapes. Floral landscapes in _kakawin_ literature are not used arbitrarily but are organized in a kind of geographical hierarchy. In the Sutasoma three conceptual categories of landscape into which plants are distributed may be initially discerned: _pura_ (capital), _dusun_ (countryside) and _wana_ (wilderness). _Pura_ includes a royal compound and the densely populated area surrounding it. _Dusun_ is a rural area outside of a pura, consisting mainly of villages with attached irrigated rice-fields (sawah), dry fields (tēgal) and gardens (kubwan). While _pura_ and _dusun_ constitute the regions of human habitation which have been to varying degrees domesticated and made
accessible to humans, *wana*, literally meaning "forest" but functionally including "seashore", represents an uncultivated wilderness area where beasts and monstrous creatures roam and which is generally not inhabited by humans excepting hunters, fishermen and notably ascetics who live in hermitages in a forest renouncing a worldly life.

The description of the flora in *pura* is surprisingly scarce in the Sutasoma *kakawin*. The pleasure garden (*taman*) in the palace of Daśabāhu's Kāśipura is mentioned in stanza 58.5 when his younger sister Candrawati is anxious about her prospective marriage to Sutasoma. "None of the flowers in the garden were able to cheer her anxious heart" and "the *tañjug* [Mimusops elengi] and *ašoka* [Jonesia asoka] flowers were ruined, because they were picked nervously to pieces." A pleasure garden Ratnālaya near Kāśipura is described in canto 66–68 more elaborately, and can be counted as the second example of this category. Although it is located far from the *pura* requiring a trip through villages to reach there, it has the more urbane characteristics of city-dwellers' playground rather than rural ones. The flora in this garden has also a symbolic significance associated with its function as an element of narrative setting. Beside blooming flowers of *gambir* (a kind of jasmine), *mēnur* (jasmine) and *gadung* (Dioscorea), there are various kinds of trees all blossoming in the garden, such as *nyū danta* (ivory coconut), *nāgapuspa* (Mesua Roxburghii), *campaka* (Michelia campaka), *punti* (banana), *pandan* (pandanus), *mayang* (blossom of the areca palm). In the pond are several kinds of lotuses blooming; *tuñjug bang* (red lotus), *kamala* (lotus), *saroja* (white lotus), *satapatra* (day lotus), *kumudā* (night lotus). There are also trees such as *dewadāru* (a kind of pine tree), *candana* (sandalwood) and *kapur* (camphor tree) enhancing the beauty of the garden. The first

---

15 The appearance of term *pasir wukir* (sea and mountain) in stanza 147.13 may indicate that the two areas—"sea", "seashore" and "mountain", "forest"—were considered by ancient Javanese to have something in common. However, there is a possibility, at least in other contexts, that *pasir wukir* means "mountainous coast" as opposed to *pasir wulusan* (flat beach) (Zoetmulder 1982: 2328).
is described as rising as high as Mount Mandara and the latter two spread fragrance over the garden. What is most interesting, however, in terms of narrative are two types of mythical trees; kalpadruma (wishing-tree) and pārijāta (coral tree). These trees are numbered among the five mythical trees (pañcauṛıkṣa) of Indra's paradise. The former is fabled to fulfill all desires and the latter is said to have been produced from the churning of the ocean and to have come into the possession of Indra. It is, therefore, evident that unlike other plants which are found in the pura-like situation, these divine trees signify the symbolic nature of the garden which corresponds well to the spatial arrangement of the garden as we shall see later.

Dusun functions as a sort of intermediate zone situated between pura and wana, enclosing the former. Hence, when Sutasoma goes on a pilgrimage towards Mount Meru leaving the palace behind, when he with his bride Candrawati travels from Kāśipura to Hastinapura, and when princess Marmanati returns to the palace of Singhala from a hermitage in the Himalaya where she has retreated, these processions in the narrative pass through countrysides. The first case is exemplary. As Sutasoma approaches a village, rice fields (sawah) come into view. Then follows a lavish description of gardens (kubwan) around a village:

9.3 The gardens were dense with pakis [fern] mixed with kajar [Remusatia vivapara] on the edges of the ravine. Various duryan [durian] and wulwan [rambutan] and manggis [mangosteen] trees were bearing fruit, and the sērēh [betel vine] crept beautifully around the pucang [areca palm for betel nut], there were aryan [sugar palm] and handuru [?] on the hill close to a hut which was sheltered by piasan gading [ivory banana] trees. . . .

The description may give the impression that the poet is merely giving a stock list of scenic elements instead of a "realistic" representation of a landscape.\textsuperscript{16} The effect, however, is purposeful, for it is precisely this sort of rich but stereotypical

\textsuperscript{16} For a detailed discussion on the function of landscape in Old Javanese narrative, see Day (1981: 12).
representation of Javanese vegetation that helps the reader to distinguish dusun from pura and wana.

Then as Sutasoma moves away from the central scene of the dusun, we see different kinds of vegetation (9.5, 7). To the north-east of the gardens is a religious establishment (pangabètan) with a dry field (tégal) and a grass field (hapa-hapa). To the south is a cemetery with various kinds of trees; wadara (jujube tree), pêng, kasine, nyagrodha (banyan) and kēpuh (Sterculia foetida). These plants are different from those found in the pura or kubwan in that they do not seem to have symbolic function as do the plants in pura or economical value as the plants in kubwan. In this sense they are more akin to the flora of wana; two of them, nyagrodha and kēpuh are also found in a wana. There are two more passages which describe the flora of dusun, which we shall examine briefly. After marrying the younger sister of the king of Kāśipura, Sutasoma travels to his parents’ capital Hastina. He and his companions come across a village in a valley (90.3). They see in the vicinity of a temple near the village nyagrodha (banyan), hambulu (a kind of tree of the ficus family), rangré (kapok) and bodhi (bodhi tree). The buildings of the temple are roofed by the fibre of the sugar palm and decorated by young coconut leaves. After passing the valley they find themselves in a dry field (tégal) which appears to be rather barren; there grow merely a few plants of alalang (a kind of high, thick grass) and kamurugan, otherwise the field is covered by stones of various sizes (90.4). The final description of a dusun scene is on the occasion when the princess of Singhala, returning from a hermitage in the Himālaya to the pura on the news of her husband’s death, passes by villages. The princess and her attendants “passed by many villages, and ravines with their clear and pure water. The priyaka-plants were blossoming everywhere, spreading fragrance, the gadung-flowers were in full bloom at the edge of the road” (103.9).

In the Sutasoma narrative specific names of plants described in a wana setting are a few because of its isolation from human habitation. The flora of a wana is generally employed in the narrative only as a signifier of “wana-ness” without signifying each plant’s individual characteristic. Wana is considered to be a sort of no
man's land generally inaccessible to ordinary people but frequented by certain groups of people. Hunters and fishermen who frequent the wana for hunting and fishing are one group. The other group of people who appear in wana are recluse ascetics who lead a meditative life in small hermitage communities, and poets, who, although not residing in wana, wander about in it to find inspiration for their works. Except for these instances, those who dare to pass through the wana run the risk of confronting dangerous animals and monsters which Sutasoma himself experiences on his journey. However, the wana is the zone through which one can reach the most sacred mountain Meru. It is situated on the reverse side of the pura. If dusun is a buffer zone between the civilized and uncivilized, wana is a liminal zone which exists between the sacred and profane. Two plants stand out in the flora of wana as narrative element. The banyan (denoted variously as nyagrodha and wata), which is found in the dusun setting as well, is firstly a tree under which the man-eater Poruṣāda injures himself in pursuit of a man (54.1, 94.2) and secondly the tree where the god Kāla abides, to whom Poruṣāda vows to offer the sacrifice of one hundred kings (110.14). The kapok (kēpuh) is also described as the abode of a savage elephant-headed monster.

---

17 Although in the Sutasoma narrative hunters do not appear, the life of fishermen at the seashore is glimpsed in stanza 85.10. However, in Kakawin literature in general hunters play a more important role than fishermen. For instance, the god Śiwa appears in the disguise of a hunter from the Kirāṭa tribe in the Arjunawiwaha and Lubdhaka, a humble hunter from the Niṣāda, is the hero in the Siwarātrikalpa.

18 In the Sutasoma narrative the sage Keśawa's and Sumitra's hermitages are described as being situated in the remote mountainous area at the foot of Mount Meru (14.1–2; 17.1–2). As for poets, stanza 29.7 recounts that near the hermitages Sutasoma comes across the remains of poet's activity of composing poems (Zoetmulder 1974: 133). More direct account is found in the kakawin Hariwangśa. In its closing stanzas the author Panuluh portrays himself as an aspirant young poet who is “wandering amongst the beauties of nature, through the mountains with their wooded slopes, their steep ravines and sweeping views, along rivers winding through valleys, and especially along beaches, with their rocks rising from the sea” (Zoetmulder 1974: 170).
Gajawaktra (29.8). Both trees appear to be associated with inauspiciousness, which pin-points one of the characteristics of *wana* itself.¹⁹

While plants are distributed in the three types of landscape, people too, as we have seen in passing in the description of the floral landscape, are situated in these settings. Kings, princes and courtiers reside in *pura*, peasants in *dusun*, and hunters, fishermen, and recluse ascetics in *wana*. Thus the narrative landscape is not only space for flora but also a social space in which people reside in a certain order which must have had some correspondence with the Javanese society just as flora correspond to Javanese experience of the natural landscape.

"Localization" of Spatial Setting

In the spatial setting of the Sutasoma narrative what we have called "Javanization" of Indian elements are found principally in the fields of cosmography, landscape and toponym. As for the cosmography, its centre, Mount Meru, is set to the south of the kingdom in accordance with the account in Javanese literary tradition of the removal of the mountain from Indian to Java. Thus, although the spatial setting is explicitly set in India and the *dwipa* system is used as general framework, the cosmography which the narrative refers to has been shifted to the reader's native land, Java. The landscape, on the other hand, is embellished by an abundance of Javanese flora. The distribution of particular types of flora and inhabitants of the landscape orders it in a way which appears to have been familiar to Javanese people. This does not mean the landscape of the narrative was intended to be an accurate representation of the real Javanese landscape, but a model, or metaphor, by which, in conjunction with the shifted cosmography, Javanese people perceived the landscape around them. Similarly toponyms situated in the spatial setting, despite their Indian origin in the

¹⁹ It appears that the use of *wana* as a symbol of the uncivilized was common in ancient Javanese society. In the Buddhist text Jinārthiprakṛti an ignorant mind is said to be like a forest infested with wild animals and the process of clearing the forest is compared with that of attaining enlightenment (2.10–15).
most cases, were not meant to signify the geographical reality outside the text, but to signify conceived Indian-ness by referring to the intertextual convention of Old Javanese literature.

The historian Wolters has shown great interest in the process of the assimilation of foreign elements, especially Indian, into Southeast Asian local cultures, a process which he refers to as “localization” (1982: 56–94). The notion throws light on our problem of “Javanization”, the complex interaction in the literary horizon between Javanese perception and imported Indian elements, such as Mount Meru, the *dwipa* system and Indian toponyms. First of all Wolters does not see the process of the assimilation of Indian elements in Southeast Asian region as a unified process, for he emphasizes cultural diversity among numerous subregions, of which fourteenth century Majapahit is but one. Thus Indian elements were “localized” variously according to the local culture in which they were subsumed. Wolters, suggesting the possibility of applying the methods of textual study to the study of Southeast Asian history, further argues that the function of these “localized” elements can be best “described in terms appropriate for identifying literary effects”, which he exemplifies through the reference to the vocabulary of textual study, such as “metaphor”, “decorative”, “rhetorical” and so on. Naturally, as Wolters suggests, the approach can be most effectively applied to the study of local literatures as examples of “localization”, the process of assimilating foreign elements into local cultural statements.

In a literary text, Wolters continues to argue, the function of foreign elements is not primarily to signify extratextual reality, something outside the text, but “point to something else inside the local cultural statement” (1982: 72). It can be said then the process of “Javanization” in the narrative is not just a process of transferring and adopting foreign elements into Indonesian literary tradition, but is rather a process of “localizing” them in the Indonesian cultural framework so that materials become not only intelligible but also “meaningful” for the reader in the sense that he or she can read into the narrative the reference to the contemporary situation.
Thus the Indian signifiers, such as Mount Meru and other Indian toponyms, are employed in the Sutasoma narrative in order to invoke "Indian-ness", which is required by the convention of kakawin genre, while in fact they have already lost their extratextual signification to India. Yet this does not then mean that they signify "Java" outside the text. The Indian signifiers do signify "India" in as much as they bring "Indian-ness" into the narrative, but the world thus signified is constructed in the horizon of expectation in such a way that the Javanese reader uses the narrated world as a model by which they perceived Javanese society. What is significant about using the notion of the horizon of expectation in this discussion is that this subtle interaction of the signifier and the signified was something understood and shared by both author and reader in the process of production and appreciation of the narrative.

The process of localization in the narrative also creates a tension between what signifies and what is signified. The use of Indian signifiers, on the one hand, provides the narrative with epic quality. It establishes a spatial and temporal distance from the place and time of the narrative act and allows the narrative to link itself to other kakawin narratives, which share the Indian signifiers. The process of localization, on the other hand, brings the narrated world closer to the contemporary world of the poet and his audience. The rich description of Javanese flora adds to the effect. In the following section we shall see that the localization of temporal setting adds to this tension. I shall then argue that this was necessitated by change of the literary horizon of expectation, which caused the author wish to make the kakawin narrative more immediately meaningful for the contemporary reader despite the distancing effect of the generic convention.

**Temporal Setting**

Like spatial setting, temporal setting is inseparable from other story elements, such as subject matter, plot and characters, and determines the nature of the story. In the Sutasoma the temporal setting of the story is explicitly declared at the beginning of the narration by the author-narrator. The fact that this information is explicitly given in
the form of the author−narrator’s commentary is not accidental but congruent with the importance of the temporal setting to the narrative. In stanza 1.4 the author−narrator states that while in the previous ages of *kṛtayuga*, *tretāyuga* and *dwāparayuga* the three principal Hindu gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Iśwara were the maintainers of the world order respectively, in the present *kaliyuga* none other than JinaPati, an epithet of Buddha, must descend to eliminate the evil:

1.4 ... / Previously in the *dwāpara*, *treta* and *kṛta* ages (*yuga*), the embodiment of all forms of the dharma (*sarwa-dharma-angga-kāra*)/ were none other than the gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Iśwara. They became kings in the world of mortal men. / But now, in the *kali* age, śri JinaPati descends here to eliminate the evil and the wicked.

What is immediately evident in this statement is, firstly, that the temporal setting of the narrative is set, according to the four *yuga* system, in the last age *kaliyuga*, in which moral standards and social order are the most morally degraded. Secondly, the narrator acknowledges that his narration takes place in the same age. In other words, not only does the narrator recount events which take place in the *kaliyuga* but he himself and the reader live in the *kaliyuga*. Therefore the world represented in the narrated story and the world in which the narrator and reader live are contemporary, though naturally the events in the story precede the time of narration. Finally, in each age different deities assume the form (*matēmah*) of a king—in the three previous ages the three principal Hindu gods but in the last the Buddha. Each of these elements “localize” the temporal setting.

**The System of Four Yuga**

The system of four *yuga*, on which the temporal setting of the Sutasoma is based, was commonly used in *kakawin* literature as the framework of temporal setting. It consists of four *yuga*: *kṛtayuga*, *tretāyuga*, *dwāparayuga* and *kaliyuga* in chronological order. The progress of time through the four ages represents a gradual
decline of moral standards and social order. The idea is graphically expressed in the traditional comparison of dharma to a sacred cow which loses its four legs (angga) one by one as each age passes by (Zimmer 1962: 13–15). The Kṛtayuga is a golden age when the holy cow of dharma stands firmly on its four legs, as the phrase “sarwa-dharma-angga-kāra” in stanza 1.4 implies. However, in the kaliyuga only a quarter of the original dharma remains functional. Then people of all the classes, ages and sexes neglect their duty, public morals are extremely low, religious beliefs are not upheld, and confusion is triumphant.

Such moral and social disorder is vividly described in the Sutasoma (26.3–27.1). When Sutasoma sojourns at the sage Sumitra’s hermitage, the goddess of the earth (bhatarl sang hyang kṣiti) emerges in front of the people and communicates to Sutasoma the desperate state of the world in the kaliyuga:

26.3 If you [Sutasoma] are not compassionate and look upon all the worlds and such as us [the goddess of the earth and others], / surely the world will be destroyed in an uproar brought about by the age of destruction [kaliyuga]. / The earth will have no seed of taste and lose all its savour. Evil will gain wealth, / the king will not care for the welfare of others [parahita] and the great religions will disappear.

26.4 Likewise all the pandita [learned man], great wipra [brahman] and the like will be besmirched; / they will be not constant in carrying out the requirements of their knowledge and will lack purity of conscience. / Women will be immoral and betray their beloved; between son and father there will be deep hostility. / The grounds of temples and monasteries will be overgrown by vegetation with no one to care for them.

26.5 The poor will be numerous and much to be pitied; the rich will be close-fisted; / for the sinful, life will be long and free of care, that of the good will be destroyed. / Devoted servants will be few, and wicked kings will serve only their pride. / The conduct of the world in the age of Kali [kaliyuga] will be filled with strife.
26.6 [The thought of this] makes me [the goddess of the earth] defiled, and I feel as if I am to be torn to pieces as the earth shakes. / Because the deeds of the malefactors are very evil, I feel a great agony; / in addition the demon king Sudāsaputra [Porusāda] supports them. / Compared with the weight [of their wickedness], the weight of the sevenfold worlds [saptāṅḍa] and their mountains is of little account.

26.7 Moreover now it is almost time for the three worlds to become one ocean [ekajaladhi]. / The earth will be shattered, the ten directions vanish; there will darkness without any guidance. / The laws of the god Buddha and Siwa will be inconceivable. / Such will be the result of the amazing ferocity of the demons.

In this statement the goddess of the earth portrays herself as as the bearer of the world, who cannot sustain it any more because of the increasing burden of evil. As a consequence the dissolution of the whole world into a single ocean (ekajaladhi) is imminent, an image often inyoked in Hindu tradition as the final stage of kaliyuga.20 Another important image in the statement representing social disorder is a pack of rampant demons lead by Porusāda. They are not merely the villains of the story but the symbol of destructive elements which undermine social order, for, as the goddess herself pleads, as in many other kakawin narratives only the pacification or annihilation of the demons by the hero can stop further deterioration and restore the lost social order. Thus, to explicitly set the story time in the kaliyuga is more than to set the story time in a temporal framework. It determines the moral character of the social order to be narrated in the story. Moreover, since the author and reader too are at present in the kaliyuga, the story could suggest a possible situation of moral and social

20 The dissolution of the whole worlds into a single ocean at the end of world-cycle is described in the Mahābhārata and purāṇa literature (Zaehner 1966: 104–5; O'Flaherty 1975: 183–4). The imagery was a well-known one in ancient Javanese society, for the term ekāṛṇawa (single ocean) was used as early as in the early eleventh century in the famous Calcutta stone inscription to describe the destruction of the Javanese kingdom in 1016 (Kern 1917: 85–114).
disorder which they have to confront in their real world. In other words, like the spatial setting, the temporal setting of the Sutasoma narrative is "localized" so that the Indian signifier *kaliyuga* can now signify the Javanese situation.

The localization of temporal setting, then, points to one of the functions of the system of four *yuga* as the mytho-chronological framework of the narrative, that is, its function as a conceptual device to legitimize kingship. In Indian political tradition it is often said that the king is the maker of his own age (*yuga*) in the sense that the situations of the four *yuga* are actually the reflection of the degree of the king's execution of administrative justice. Wolters points out cases in Southeast Asian history in which the king was regarded as the maker of *yuga*. For instance, the architectural design of the Angkor Wat complex in Cambodia, built in the twelfth century during the reign of Suryavarman II, is based on the Indian cosmological calculation in such a way that "when one enters the complex, one is turning one's back on the present and deteriorating age, the *kali yuga*, and returning to the first or golden age [*krtayuga*], represented by the king's reign" (1982: 60). Similarly a Cham ruler legitimized his accession to the throne by writing a Sanskrit treatise in which he declared that his kingdom was in the *krtayuga* (1982: 61).

In the opening or closing passages of some *kakawin* Javanese rulers are eulogized as divine incarnations who descended to the island of Java to restore a splendour which the country had lost on the arrival of the *kaliyuga*. The most notable example probably is the epilogue of the *kakawin* Bhāratayuddha, which eulogizes the mid-twelfth century Javanese king Jayabhaya. According to the *kakawin*, after the...

---

21 In the Manusmṛti 9.301–2 it is said that the four *yuga* ages reflect the kings' behaviour and therefore the king is synonymous with *yuga*. Thus, it is said, the king is *kaliyuga* when he sleeps, *dwāparayuga* when he rises from sleep, *tretāyuga* when he exerts himself, and *krtayuga* when he moves (Ghoshal 1959: 164). The notion of the king being identical with a *yuga* and being the maker of his epoch is also found in Book 14 Śantiparvan of the Mahābhārata in which Bhima puts forwards the notion (92.6, 139.10) and explains that the four *yuga* arise according to how the king conducts the administration of justice (70.6–25) (Ghoshal 1959: 199).
battle between the Pāṇḍava and Korawa is over and peace is restored, Krṣṇa, the incarnation of Viṣṇu, returns to heaven:

With the arrival of the Kali era, however, misfortune and calamity make their appearance once more, so that the incomparably beautiful island of Java, dominated by evil beings in the absence of Viṣṇu as chief protector, loses all its lustre. The latter is moved by pity to descend to earth once more. He, who as Krṣṇa was universally celebrated for his victories, now bears the name of bhaṭāra Jayabhaya. Within a short time all his enemies are forced into submission, and prosperity and peace reign supreme again. (Zoetmulder 1974: 270)

A similar notion is also expressed in the eulogistic passages of the kakawin Hariwangśa, Smaradahana and Ghaṭotkacāśraya. However, what separates the Sutasoma kakawin from other kakawin in connection with the kaliyuga is the temporal setting of the story. In the Sutasoma the story time itself is set in the kaliyuga and the hero takes on the task of restoring the lost social order. In other kakawin, on the other hand, although the kaliyuga may be mentioned in the eulogies, the temporal setting of the story time is not in the kaliyuga but one of the preceding yuga. Thus the story itself does not deal with the social disorder in the kaliyuga.

The hero Sutasoma, as the crown prince of the kingdom Hastina, is of course endowed with the responsibility to protect his people and maintain social order just as any king or princely figure of any yuga. In the kaliyuga, among all the kings, it is only the prince Sutasoma who can accomplish the task, for moral standards and social
order, or dharma, which are lost in kaliyuga can be restored by no one other than an incarnation of Buddha. This is why the goddess of the earth, after describing the social disorder in the kaliyuga, pleads with Sutasoma to commit himself to the elimination of the evil:

27.1 Thus will be the fate of the world if you do not agree to become king, as there is no one else who can eliminate the power of this foe, the son of Sudaśa [Poruṣāda]. As long as an incarnation of Jina is king, even in the age of destruction [kaliyuga], he is able to protect the world, but if this is not so, the whole world will surely be in grief and confusion.

When evil is finally pacified by the hero, the image of the restored order, analogous to that of the kṛtayuga emerges. This is the same kind of effect that the architectural design of the Cambodian temple or the Cham Sanskrit treatise attempted to achieve. Stanzas at the end of the story describe the condition of the world thus:

147.18 The world was undisturbed after the demons became good-hearted. There was no talk of evil people, wrong-doers, or illness; there was only happiness as there were no malefactors. Moreover among the soldiers and officers, there was none who disobeyed the king’s [Sutasoma’s] orders; all followed the essence of knowledge, as—it is said—that the king’s teachings were the guidance of their hearts.

147.19 This was why the entire world was prosperous up to the sky. All the hermits made the utmost to win salvation. Food was abundant, there was no lack of long rains, and the fall was constant. Prosperous and peaceful was the world, and Kāli (the evil one) fell into difficulties and perished during the reign of king Mahājina.

In contrast to the statement made by the goddess of the earth at the beginning of the story, here the subjugation of the demons symbolizes the restoration of social order. The restored order is signified by the prevalence of happiness, military obedience to royal authority, respect for the king’s teachings, intent observation of religious practice
by the hermits, and an abundance of food guaranteed by constant rainfall, in other words, it is a social order marked by prosperity and peace. These achievements at a secular level certainly may legitimize the king’s reign. At a metaphysical level, on the other hand, the hero’s legitimation is achieved by his act of reversing the deteriorating process of the kaliyuga and of aborting the final destruction of the entire world due in the kaliyuga. It is at this level that the localization of the temporal setting is closely connected to the process of legitimization, making the story particularly exemplary to the Javanese reader who believed themselves to live in the kaliyuga.

The Unity of the Represented World

The significance of the localization of the temporal setting of the Sutasoma narrative will be further elucidated, if we situate the narrative in a series of kakawin works. However, setting all the known kakawin works, including the Sutasoma, in a chronological order alone is not enough to understand the relationship between the works, for, as Jauss asserts, “the relationship between the individual text and the series of texts formative of a genre presents itself as a process of the continual founding and altering of horizons” (1982: 88). Thus what is required here is to investigate how the relationship between the Sutasoma and the series of kakawin works was perceived in the horizon of expectation when the Sutasoma appeared before the Javanese reading community. To achieve this objective I shall propose an alternative literary series of kakawin works based on the chronological order not of the production of works but of the temporal setting of the stories. Jauss has already argued that “not only the canonized major and minor genres can constitute a group and be described in terms of the history of genres, but also other series of works that are bound by a structure forming a continuity and that appear historically” (1982: 80). Thus it is possible to establish the continuity in a series of kakawin works by, among many other possibilities, referring to the four yuga system used as the temporal framework of the stories.
The following is a table of the series of *kakawin* works composed before the Sutasoma, in which relevant *parwa* works, although they belong to a different genre, are included when they are relevant to understanding the horizon of expectation. The entries include: title, indication of *parwa* work if the work is one, estimated date of production, and a brief summary of the story.23

I *Kṛtayuga* (the deeds of gods and demons)

1. Ādīparwa (*parwa*, end of 10th century). A part of this *parwa*, the first book of the Mahābhārata, recounts the events in the *kṛtayuga*. The story includes the famous episode of the churning of the ocean from which the *amṛta* (elixir of immortality) emerges.24

2. Smaradahana (c. 1185). The story recounts Kāma’s death at the hands of Śiwa and the birth of Gaṇa, another name of Gaṇeśa, who kills the demon Nilarudraka. Kāma is finally reincarnated in Java as king Kāmeśvara.

II *Tretāyuga* (the Rāmāyaṇa cycle)

The appearance of human characters marks the beginning of this age. The Rāmāyaṇa cycle, which represents this age, recounts mainly the deeds of the prince Rāma, an incarnation of Viṣṇu.

3. Sumanasāntaka (c. 1204). The romance of Aja and Indumati, who are Rāma’s grandparents. Although the story is genealogically connected to the Rāmāyaṇa cycle, it is not derivative of the Sanskrit epic but of Kālidāsa’s *kavya* Raghuvarhīśa.25

4. Arjunawijaya (c. 1367–79). The story is the expansion of the first half of the Uttarakāṇḍa, the last section of the Rāmāyaṇa narrative. It involves

---

23 For the date and summary of the works, see Zoetmulder (1974) except for the date of the Rāmāyaṇa, for which see Robson (1980).

24 A later minor *kakawin* called Hariwijaya, probably composed in Bali, extensively deals with the episode of the churning of the ocean and subsequent events.

25 For the relationship of the *kakawin* to Indian literature, see Zoetmulder (1974: 307–11).
the origin of the demon Rāwaṇa and his defeat by Arjuna Sahasrabāhu, who is to be later killed by Paraśurāma.26

5. Rāmāyaṇa (mid-9th century). The story of Rāma and his wife Sitā. Rāma kills the demon Rāwaṇa and recovers his abducted wife. An early part of the story briefly recounts Rāma’s encounter with Paraśurāma.

6. Uttarakāṇḍa (parwa, end of 10th century). The second half of this parwa narrative recounts the sequel to the Rāmāyaṇa: Sitā’s exile, the birth of Kuśa and Lawa, and her descent to the nether world. The occasion on which the first recitation of the Rāmāyaṇa takes place is also described. Rāma’s return to the heaven after ten thousand years of reign marks the end of the tretāyuga.

III Dvāparayuga

A. (the Mahābhārata cycle)

The Mahābhārata cycle recounts the conflict between the two branches of the Bhārata clan, Pāṇḍava and Korawa. The Sanskrit Mahābhārata consists of eighteen books, some of which were summarized in extant Old Javanese parwa texts (book one, four, five, six, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen and eighteen).

7. Ādiparwa (parwa, end of 10th century). The main part of this parwa, the first book of the Mahābhārata, narrates the origin of the Pāṇḍava and the Korawa. Toward the end of the parwa the episode of Arjuna’s twelve year solitary exile is narrated, in which his amorous adventures, his elopement with Subhadra and the birth of his son Abhimanyu occur.27 The second book Sabhāparwa and the third book Wanaparwa, which recount the assembly at Hastinapura and the Pāṇḍava’s twelve year exile in the forest respectively, do not exist in Old Javanese literature. However, an episode from the latter was adapted in the Arjunawiwaha described below.

8. Arjunawiwaha (c. 1028–35). The story, a loose adaptation of the Wanaparwa, recounts Arjuna’s deeds during the Pāṇḍava’s twelve year

26 Although the story of the Arjunawijaya ends at Rāwaṇa’s capture and subsequent release by Arjuna Sahasrabāhu, the Uttarakāṇḍa contains several episodes which follow the story of the Arjunawijaya, including Indra’s defeat by Rāwaṇa’s son, Meghanādha.

27 A later minor kakawin called Subhadráwiwaha, or Pārthāyana, composed probably at the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century, is an expanded adaptation of the episode of Arjuna’s twelve year exile.
exile. It involves Arjuna’s penance on Mount Indrakila, unsuccessful seduction by nymphs, grant of a supernatural weapon from Śiwa, Arjuna’s killing of the demon Niwātakawaca and his wedding with nymphs.\(^{28}\)

9. Wirāṭaparwa (parwa, end of 10th century). The story of this parwa, the fourth book of the epic, narrates the Pāṇḍava’s sojourn at king Wirāṭa’s court.\(^{29}\)

10. Bhāratayuddha (1157). The story, which describes the final battle between the Pāṇḍava and the Korawa, is taken from the Mahābhārata books five to ten, some of which exist as parwa texts.\(^{30}\) The return of Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍava to the heaven marks the end of dwāparayuga. In the epilogue of the Bhāratayuddha Wiśnu is said to be incarnated in Java as King Jayabhaya.

B. (the Kṛṣṇa cycle)

The Kṛṣṇa cycle represents the same spatio-temporal setting as the Mahābhārata cycle, but its story focuses on the deeds of Kṛṣṇa, an incarnation of Wiśnu and the cousin of the three of the Pāṇḍava.

11. Hariwangṣa (c. 1135–57). Kṛṣṇa’s abduction of Rukmiṇī and subsequent confrontation with Jarāsandha’s army. It is stated in the prologue of the kakawin that in the kaliyuga Wiśnu is incarnated in Java as King Jayabhaya.

---

\(^{28}\) There is a kakawin called Pārthayajñā, which is also an expansion of the Wanaparwa (37.39–42), recounting Arjuna’s journey to Mount Indrakila. Although the date of its composition is not known, the story is represented in reliefs on Candi Jago near Malang, the temple in which, according to the Nāgarakṛtāgama (41.4), the Singhasari king Wiśnuwardhana, who died in 1268, is venerated as Buddha (Zoetmulder 1974: 372), although the statue adored at the temple is, to be exact, Amoghapāśa. Therefore, though the date of the kakawin is not clear, it is quite possible that by the time the Sutasoma was composed a version of the Pārthayajñā story was well-known among the reading community, thus constituting its horizon of expectation.

\(^{29}\) The Abhimanyuwiwāha, a later minor kakawin, is a close adaptation of Wirāṭaparwa.

\(^{30}\) The last four books of the Mahābhārata, which recount the aftermath of the battle, including the death of Kṛṣṇa, also exist as parwa texts, but they are considered to be later products (Zoetmulder 1974: 97).
12. Kṛṣṇāyana (c. 1204). The story of this kakawin is basically the same as
the Hariwangsa, but is closer to the Indian tradition than the latter.31

13. Ghatotkačaśraya (c. 1194–1205). The marriage of Arjuna’s son
Abhimanyu with Kṛṣṇa’s daughter Kṣiti Sundari and Wirāta’s daughter
Uttari.

14. Bhomāntaka, or Bhomakāwyā (date unknown).32 The marriage of
Kṛṣṇa’s son Samba and his romance with Yajñawati. Finally Kṛṣṇa kills
the demon Bhoma (Naraka).33

IV Kaliyuga

15. Ādiparwa (parwa, end of 10th century). The first part of this parwa
provides the framework in which the main part of the epic is narrated. The
snake sacrifice ordered by King Janamejaya, great-grandson of Arjuna,
occais the recitation by the sage Byāsa of the story about the Pāṇḍava
and the Korawa.

As far as the two major Indian epics are concerned this is the last event in
the represented time. Most Buddhist narratives, including the jātaka
stories, represent this age, because Buddha was born in this age.

16. Sutasoma (c. 1379–89). The events take place in India, while the hero
Sutasoma, a descendant of the Pāṇḍava, is the incarnation of Waiprocana.

17. Nāgarakrtāgama (1365). The story, set in contemporary Java, describes
the genealogy and the deeds of King Rājasanagara.

31 The episode of Kṛṣṇa’s abduction of Rukmini must have gained
considerable popularity in ancient Javanese society by the time the Sutasoma was
composed, for it is depicted in a series of reliefs on the second terrace of Canḍi
Panataran, whose main part was constructed in the mid-fourteenth century.

32 Although the author and date of this kakawin is not known, it has been
generally agreed based on internal evidence that the kakawin was composed in the
Kaḍiri period. If the reference in the Hariwangsa to the “well-known story of
Yajñawati” in fact refers to this kakawin, this is one of the earliest of East Javanese
kakawin.

33 A kakawin called Narakawijaya was made later in Bali. The story is
described as a “supplement to the Bhomāntaka” (Zoetmulder 1974: 405), for it
expands and fills a gap in the latter. It recounts the birth and youth of Yajñawati and
Bhoma’s victory over Druma, at which point the reader has to turn to the
Bhomāntaka for the conclusion.
The table discloses that in the series of the kakawin and parwa works, or rather in the series of the stories narrated in the kakawin works, there is a unity in the sense that the stories are not an array of disparate episodes but cohere within a structure of temporal and spatial settings, and relationships between characters based on genealogy and incarnation. Firstly, the stories of the narratives, in particular those composed before the Nāgarakṛtāgama, share the single spatio-temporal world, the Indian world in which all the events take place according to the four yuga. In this spatio-temporal framework each age imposes its own characteristics on the stories belonging to the age. In the kṛtayuga the characters are all divine, whether gods or demons and the events are also of divine nature, like the churning of the ocean. However, as the perfection of dharma gradually withers away, human characters play an increasingly greater role and the events assume a more human tone. The conflict between the human protagonist Rāma and the demon protagonist Rāvana of the Rāmāyaṇa story, which dominates tretāyuga, represents a transitionary stage. Then the dwāparayuga sees the major power struggle between the two human groups to be recounted in the Mahābhārata cycle. In this way the nature of the stories gradually shifts from divine to human in accordance with the decline of dharma in the framework of the system of four yuga.

Within this framework genealogy operates as an important conceptual device to make the narrated world cohesive by connecting a group of stories together. The main characters of the Sumanasāntaka, Aja and Indumati, for instance, are connected with the Rāmāyaṇa through the fact that they are grandparents of Rāma, the protagonist of the latter. Although the Sumanasāntaka story is not derivative of the Sanskrit epic, the cohesion of the two works appear to be well-established in the Javanese horizon of expectation. Another example is the kakawin Ghaṭotkacāsraya, which belongs to the Kṛṣṇa cycle set in the dwāparayuga. Its story, which recounts the marriage of Kṛṣṇa’s daughter Kṣiti Sundari and Arjuna’s son, is genealogically connected to the stories of Kṛṣṇa himself. However, unlike Samba, Kṛṣṇa’s son appearing in the
Bhomântaka kakawin and other Indian works, Kṣiti Sundari appears to be a Javanese invention in order to link the story to the existing Kṛṣṇa cycle, for the character is totally unknown in Indian tradition (Zoetmulder 1974: 290). Finally, the Sutasoma narrative manages to link its story set in the kaliyuga to the Mahābhārata cycle set in the dwāparayuga by claiming, through the statement of the respectable sage Sumitra, that the hero Sutasoma is an descendant of the Pāṇḍawâ.

Another cohesive device adopted from Indian tradition to link stories together beyond a particular yuga period are divine characters and their incarnations (awatâra). Hindu gods play part not only as main characters in the stories set in the kṛtayuga but also in the subsequent yuga although in peripheral roles. Their roles are largely confined to lesser ones such as those of “donor”, “helper” and “dispatcher”, to use Propp’s terminology, rather than those of main roles as “hero” or “villain”. In the Arjunawiwâha, for instance, Śiwa is the “donor” who grants a magical boon to the human “hero” Arjuna and Indra the “dispatcher” who requests him to kill the demon “villain”. Hindu gods also give continuity to the stories through their incarnation as human characters in various ages other than the kṛtayuga. Unlike gods, who appear as a god in a lesser role, as human character, they can assume an important role. The Mahābhārata cycle provides a well-known example in which the heroic Pāṇḍawâ brothers, Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhima, Arjuna, Nakula and Sahadewa, are fathered by five Hindu deities, Dharma, Bāyu, Indra and the Aswîn twins respectively. Thus, in the Arjunawiwâha, one episode from the Mahābhārata cycle, although Arjuna, the son of Indra, takes the role of hero, Indra himself and Śiwa appear as gods, whose roles are peripheral ones.

Among all the Hindu gods, however, the one who is most entangled with the system of four yuga may be Viṣṇu, for he incarnates himself as heroic character.

34 Propp distinguishes seven fundamental roles assumed by characters (1968: 79–80). They are: the villain, the donor (who gives the hero some magical agent), the helper, a princess (a sought-for person) and her father, the dispatcher (who sends the hero on adventures), the hero and the false hero.
throughout the four ages to restore social order. His ten incarnations and the ages, in which their appearances are generally ascribed, are as follows (O’Flaherty 1975: 175):

1. The Fish (Matsya)  Kṛtayuga
2. The Tortoise (Kūrma)  Kṛtayuga
3. The Boar (Warāha)  Kṛtayuga
4. The Man Lion (Narasīrīha)  Kṛtayuga
5. The Dwarf (Vāmana)  Tretāyuga
6. Paraśurāma  Tretāyuga
7. Rāma  Tretāyuga
8. Kṛṣṇa  Dwāparayuga
9. Buddha  Kaliyuga
10. Kalkin  Kaliyuga

Viṣṇu appears as a mythological creature in his first four incarnations during the kṛtayuga, though the fourth incarnation is a transitional form of being a half-human. From the fifth incarnation onwards Viṣṇu incarnates himself only as human characters, among whom Rāma in the Rāmāyaṇa and Kṛṣṇa in the Mahābhārata and Kṛṣṇa cycles are the most prominent roles during the tretāyuga and dwāparayuga, and therefore the most important to the Javanese horizon of expectation, although Paraśurāma also appears briefly in the Rāmāyaṇa and is alluded in the Arjunawijaya. Each story associated with Viṣṇu’s incarnation typically begins with the state of apparent equilibrium, then continues with an account of the destruction of equilibrium by the evil, and finally ends with the restoration of equilibrium through the victory of Viṣṇu’s incarnation over the evil. This story pattern evidently accords with Viṣṇu’s main role as maintainer of the world who vows to descend to earth from time to time in order to protect the good, destroy the evil and re-establish dharma (Zaehner 1966: 91).

It is thus possible to argue that the literary series of kakawin narratives based on the chronological order of the story time instead of the date of composition may have been the literary series that was more significant in the Javanese horizon of expectation. By the time the Sutasoma was composed in the fourteenth century, this alternative literary series had already constructed a vast imagined world which was set
in its own spatial setting, chronologically ordered according to the four yuga system, and whose characters were interconnected by genealogy and incarnation. If that was the case, for the fourteenth century audience, for instance, whether the Arjunawijaya was composed before or after the Rāmāyaṇa would not have been as important as the understanding that the story of the Arjunawijaya preceded that of the Rāmāyaṇa and that both were part of a larger coherent story world. This represented world is indeed Bakhtin’s “epic past” as conceived in the Javanese horizon of expectation.

A New Horizon of Expectation

Since the “epic past” represented in a kakawin narrative is by definition separated by “an absolute epic distance” from the contemporary world in which the narration takes place, if story time comes closer to the narration time, the epic-ness of the narrative would be called into question. The system of four yuga is one narrative device to provide a narrative with a convenient framework to divide narrative time into the narrated “past” of kṛtayuga, tretāyuga or dwāparayuga, and the narrating “now” of the kaliyuga, thus ensuring the “epic distance” between two times. The Mahābhārata narrative is very aware of the fact that its poetic production occurs in the kaliyuga, when it explains in its first book Ādiparwa how the first recitation of the Mahābhārata story composed by the sage Byāsa takes place during King Janamejaya’s snake sacrifice. It is evident that the recitation takes place in the kaliyuga, for the king is the great-grandson of Arjuna, whose return with his brothers to heaven marks the end of the dwāparayuga. At this point the narrative comes to a critical moment in that not only the narrated time and the narrating time are fused into one time but is set in the same age in which the audience lives.35 Now that the “epic distance” is an essential aspect of the horizon of expectation of kakawin literature, it would be difficult to maintain the

35 The second half of the Uttarākāṇḍa also describes the occasion on which the Rāmāyaṇa, composed by the sage Bālmiki, is for the first time recited. However, since the recitation happens during Rāma’s reign, it is supposed to be happening still in the “epic past” of tretāyuga.
“epic distance” in the story beyond the dwāparayuga. In fact there is no extant kakawin narrative recounting a story set in the kaliyuga which is directly based on the Indian epics.

Nevertheless, a few major kakawin works were composed which set their story time in the kaliyuga, namely, the Sutasoma and the Nāgarakṛtāgama, composed around two decades earlier than the Sutasoma. The authors, however, must have had technical difficulties unknown to their predecessors in composing these works. Firstly, as we have seen, the author could not rely on the Indian epics to provide materials for a story set in the kaliyuga. Secondly, and probably more importantly, the author had to deal with the tension between the “epic distance” which kakawin genre demanded and the “localization” of temporal setting which the kaliyuga setting imposes on the story. The appearance of these kakawin works despite these difficulties in the late fourteenth century is indicative enough of the emergence of a new horizon of expectation of kakawin literature at that time.

As for the Nāgarakṛtāgama, the author Prapañca had no choice but to set the story in contemporary time, for the narrative, instead of recounting the Indian epic, chronicles events in Majapahit kingdom and describes the genealogy and deeds of King Rājasangara. The work was undoubtedly intended to praise the glory of the kingdom and eulogize the king and his ancestors. Therefore it is inevitable that the spatio-temporal setting of this kakawin is the most “localized”, being explicitly set in Java as well as in the kaliyuga. A passage describing the Singhasari king Kṛtanāgara,

36 There are two other major kakawin from the late Majapahit period worth mentioning in this connection. The Śivarātrikalpa is the only kakawin confirmed to derive from Indian purāṇa literature. Although the story time is not specified in the narrative, there is a distinct possibility that the story time is set in the kaliyuga, considering the fact that the main character is not an epic hero but a humble hunter, and that the story derives from purāṇa literature, which usually sets the story time in the kaliyuga. The story time of the Kuñjarakarna kakawin is also not specified in the narrative. In this case the story does not give us a clue to determine the story time, because it is not related to any known Indian literature. The presence of the Supreme Buddha Wairocana, however, indicates that the story time is set in the kaliyuga.
who is considered an ancestor of the Majapahit kings, mentions the difficulty of ruling in the *kaliyuga*: 37

**42.3** Verily he [Krtanaga] was a Prince not negligent, free from intoxication, the more very [sic] zealous in management, / for he was clear-sighted as to the difficulties of the world’s protection to be exercised in the period of Kali./ . . .

Then the situation in the *kaliyuga* is described:

**43.1** . . . /Then at Their [the Pandawa brothers’] returning home [that is, to heaven] was the beginning of Kali. It occurred that the world grew greedy and tumultuous. / . . .

Thus, although strong emphases in the narrative on topics such as the deification of the royal ancestors, the glorification of the Majapahit rule and the praise of the king suggest that the very composition of the *kakawin* can be seen as an attempt to create “national past”, the lack of “absolute epic distance” as seen in other *kakawin* works is evident. In this sense the Nagrakrta-gama may be better described as the case of one text constituting a genre.

Compared to the Nagrakrta-gama, the represented world of the Sutasoma narrative appears to maintain a closer link with the represented world of the narratives of the old horizon. Though the temporal setting is set in the *kaliyuga* and some aspects of the spatial setting are, as we have seen in the previous section, “localized”, the story in general is set in an “Indian” world with its cosmography and toponyms. As for character, not only the hero Sutasoma is genealogically related to the Pandawa, the heroes of the Mahabharata cycle, but two other main characters King Daśabahu and King Jayawikrama, who also fight against the demon king Purusāda, are described as

---

incarnations of Hindu gods Brahmā and Viśṇu respectively. In addition there are several appearances of Indra in various capacities. All of these enable the Sutasoma story to be linked with the “epic past” as narrated by other kakawin works. It is also interesting to note, in this connection, that in the story there is an attempt to widen the “epic breadth” of the story, though not to link the story with the “epic past”. At the Buddhist hermitage near Mount Meru the knowledgeable sage Sumitra recounts to Sutasoma the story about Sutasoma and Poruṣāda in their previous incarnation (21.1–23.5). At that time Sutasoma was the prince Agrakumāra and Poruṣāda was the demon king Suciloma. When Suciloma, who was in reality the incarnation of the kaliyuga, laid waste to the entire world, the Buddha (Jinarāja) incarnated himself as the prince Agrakumāra out of compassion for the world. In a battle the prince effortlessly seized the demon, who consequently begged his life. Satisfied with the

---

38 Daśabāhu, born as a result of his father’s invocation of Brahmā, is also called Brahmāja (born of Brahmā) (20.6). Jayawikrama on the other hand realizes during the combat with Poruṣāda that he is the incarnation of Cakrapāṇi (disc-handed, an epithet of Viśṇu) (101.11).

39 Indra appears four times at various moments in the story in the capacities of what may be designated in Propp’s terms as “helper” (who liquidates misfortune often by the use of a magical agent) and “dispatcher” (who requests the hero to solve the problem) (Propp 1968: 79). As “helper”, firstly he interferes with the demon Gajawaktra, who is about to destroy the world, and asks Sutasoma to pacify him (32.9–10). Secondly, by the power of meditation he resurrects Sutasoma, who has sacrificed his own life to save a starving tigress (36.3–37.1). Finally, at Sutasoma’s request, he resurrects all the fallen warriors by showering amṛta (147.7–8). Indra’s role as “dispatcher” is rather complex. The god first orders the celestial nymphs (apsara) to tempt Sutasoma from his meditation so that he will resume his royal duty of protecting the worlds from demonic threats. However, when the plot fails, he transforms himself into a beautiful goddess to seduce Sutasoma. This again fails and Sutasoma manifests his true identity as Wairocana, with whom Indra, resuming his original form, pleads to have compassion for the worlds and pacify the demon Poruṣāda (43.2–54.3). Later, when the god of destruction Rudra, who has possessed the demon Poruṣāda, threatens to destroy the worlds in the form of kālāgni (the world-destroying fire), Indra hastily descends from the heaven and asks Sutasoma to pacify the god (139.8).
demon’s repentance, the prince released him and instructed him in the teachings of the Buddha. Then the demon was engaged in practising the tranquility of mind (kaśāntikan) for twenty-five years and, when died, became one with the Buddha (Jinendra). Sumitra’s narrative is a good example of a narrative embedded in a main narrative, and it has the function of anticipation, for Agrakumāra’s victory over Śuciloma suggests Sutasoma’s victory over Poruṣāda at the end of the main story.\textsuperscript{40} It also serves to link the main story with the distant past. However, unlike the Arjunawijaya, Sumitra’s narrative does not achieve the link between the main story and “epic past”, for the story of Agrakumāra and Śuciloma is also set in the kaliyuga and thus it has no relation with events in the “epic past”.

Despite several attempts to link the story with the old horizon of expectation, it is apparent that the Sutasoma narrative presumes an entirely new horizon of expectation. In the first place it is a Buddhist kakawin and therefore it is evidently in compatible with the old horizon, which is oriented towards Hinduism. Secondly, because the story time is set in the kaliyuga, the author can not draw on narrative materials from the “epic past” but has to either find new materials outside the old horizon or create them by himself. In other words, there is a tension between the fact that the Sutasoma narrative is a kakawin on the one hand and the fact that the narrative recounts a Buddhist story set in the kaliyuga on the other hand.

The identification of the hero Sutasoma as the incarnation of Buddha indicates the Buddhist nature of the narrative. It is also a means of “localization”, for the incarnation of Buddha signals the kaliyuga, in contrast to Hindu gods who signal the “epic past”. This, however, is another cause of the narratological tension. According to the Hindu tradition, as we have seen, Gautama Buddha, the founder of Buddhism, is Wiṣṇu’s ninth incarnation in the kaliyuga. Thus at first glance it may seem natural for a work belonging to the kakawin genre, whose horizon of expectation is derived

\textsuperscript{40} We shall discuss this point again in the next chapter under the notion of “mirror-text”.
from the Hindu literary tradition, to deal with the theme of Buddha's descent to earth in the *kaliyuga*, even though Buddhism would not accept the assumption of Buddha being the incarnation of a Hindu deity. However, Viṣṇu's intention in incarnating himself as Buddha is not benevolent. He does so in order to preach the evil anti-Vedic religion, that is, Buddhism, and by doing so to encourage demons and wicked men to abandon the rightful teachings of the Vedas and reject the socially fundamental caste system. By accepting Buddhism thus these demons and people are, from the Hindu point of view, effectively corrupting themselves, hence paving the way to self-destruction (O'Flaherty 1975: 231–5). Thus, the incorporation of the incarnation of Buddha as genuine saviour of the world in the *yuga* system adds to the tension in this narrative.

It is of interest to point out here that before he wrote the Sutasoma the author Tantular had already proved himself as a poet capable of handling the material relating the "epic past" by composing the Arjunawijaya. The Arjunawijaya is truly part of the "epic past", for its story is based on the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, the last section of the *Rāmāyaṇa* narrative. The story, set in the India of the *tretāyuga*, recounts the fight between the human king Arjuna Sahasrabāhu and the demon king Rāvana, which results in the latter's capture by the former. It is also in a sense a prelude to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for at the end of the story the protagonist Rāvana is not slain but released and his future death at the hands of Rāma in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is prophesied. In addition the death of Arjuna Sahasrabāhu by Paraśurāma is prophesied. This episode is told in the *Ādiparwa* (Supomo 1977: 332). Paraśurāma also appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in which he challenges Rāma and is embarrassingly defeated. Thus the audience must have immediately recognized the story of the Arjunawijaya as part of the represented
world of the "epic past" when it was first composed and no doubt supplemented its inconclusive ending by linking the story to the Rāmāyana.41

Tantular's shift from the Arjunawijaya to the Sutasoma, then, indicates a significant change in the horizon of expectation which the author must have envisaged in his writing the kakawin work. This problem is particularly important, since "the succession of the works of one author", as Jauss suggests, can constitute a legitimate literary series in the horizon of expectation (1982: 80). The significance of the change taking place in the Sutasoma narrative may be examined in terms of two aspects, one literary and the other socio-historical. Firstly, it appears that it is the literary situation of the late fourteenth century Java that necessitated the change. As I have pointed out in chapter two, there are several points in chapter two, there are several points in the Sutasoma narrative which indicate from the narratological point of view the transitional character of the Sutasoma. It has the characteristics of kidung literature, in particular those of the courtly romance kidung, in the sense that it is a story recounting the deeds of an unmarried wandering prince who lives in the kaliyuga. But, at the same time, it is a kakawin story in the sense that it is a story recounting the deeds of a deity, who incarnates himself in India as a descendent of the epic heros and restores cosmic order. This transitional character of the Sutasoma narrative may have been a direct consequence of Tantular's attempt to respond to the emergence of kidung literature and of a new horizon of expectation which accompanied this new genre. Kidung made it possible to narrate stories about Javanese situations by casting off the constraints required of kakawin literature, although it still in debt to kakawin in many respects. We may conjecture that after the mid-fourteenth century kakawin literature came under an increasing pressure from the emergence of kidung literature to accommodate the desire in the literary community to deal with the contemporary situation. Several

41 Although the story is situated in the "epic past", this does not mean that there is no reference to the contemporary reality. Supomo suggests the "localization" of the landscape described in the story (Supomo 1977: 49–68).
attempts were made to compose *kakawin* works based on this new horizon of expectation, but in general they appeared not to last long, for *kakawin* literature ceased to be the dominant field of literary activity towards the fifteenth century, giving up its position to *kidung* and other vernacular literature. In this context the Nāgarakṛtāgama *kakawin* should be seen as exceptional or experimental in that it is the only *kakawin* that directly dealt with the contemporary Javanese situation. The Sutasoma *kakawin* is another attempt to accommodate the desire. However, compared with the Nāgarakṛtāgama, which sets its story explicitly in contemporary Java, telling of events which occurred there, so that it might directly legitimize the contemporary kingship, the Sutasoma appears to be something of a compromise between the two horizons, setting the story time in the *kaliyuga* but falling short of setting the story space in Java despite the “localization” of the landscape. Nevertheless, as we have explained in this chapter, the “localization” of spatial and temporal settings operating in the narrative evidently succeeded in making the story more intelligible to the contemporary audience.

Secondly, however, to understand why the narrative was constructed in the way it was, it is necessary to examine the narrative in the socio-historical context. In this connection, to use Jauss’s term, we need to consider the possibility that the narrative may have been regarded by the contemporary reader as an answer to the problems raised in the horizon of expectation:

The historicity of literature as well as its communicative character presupposes a dialogical and at once processlike relationship between work, audience, and new work that can be conceived in the relations between message and receiver as well as between question and answer, problem and solution. (Jauss 1982: 19)

For instance, it is possible, because of the “localization” of the temporal setting, to see the teachings of the incarnation of Buddha in the *kaliyuga* as a strategy to cope with the problems in the extratextual reality, for the real world is also believed to be in the *kaliyuga*. In the following chapters we shall examine the narrative increasingly from
the socio-historical point of view. In chapter four the focus of our investigation will be set on the religious aspects of the horizon of the expectation concerning the Sutasoma narrative, in particular the conditions which made it possible to introduce the incarnation of Wairocana Buddha into the *kakawin* narrative and the motive for the introduction.
CHAPTER FOUR
RELIGIOUS ASPECT

Modes of Representation of the Religious Aspect

In this chapter we shall turn our attention to the religious aspect of the Sutasoma narrative. Our attempt here is not so much to draw a comprehensive picture of the religious situation of the late fourteenth century Majapahit kingdom as to investigate religious conditions which made this particular narrative possible.¹ In this regard it seems suitable first of all to suggest three ways in which religion may be represented in narrative and then to discuss the problem of evaluating the religious elements represented in the narrative.

Firstly, the author–narrator may directly explicate religious ideas in the narration. The opening stanzas of the Sutasoma narrative is a good example. Here the author–narrator makes it clear straightaway to the audience that in the kaliyuga only the incarnation of Jinapati (Wairocana) can save the world from social and moral degradation (1.4). The statement not only sets the context in which the story is to unfold but also suggests to the contemporary audience that the Buddha is superior to the Hindu gods.

Secondly, religious ideas may be enunciated in a speech made by a character in the story. Usually it is a priest or some other kind of knowledgeable character.² This


² Sometimes a speech is a narrative with its own spatio-temporal setting, characters and events, in which case the character who narrates is a secondary narrator
mode is often used to represent complex and abstract religious ideas in an effective way. Sutasoma’s two lengthy sermons to the newly converted disciples—one to Gajawaktra, the snake and the tigress, and the other to Poruṣāda and the god Kāla—are examples (38.3–42.2, 145.2–147.4), while the gods’ statement that the truth of Buddha and that of Siwa are identical is another (139.3–7).

Finally, a facet of religion may be represented in the story in the form of an event or a sequence of events. As we shall see below, Sutasoma’s journey from the palace to Mount Meru through wana and then back to the palace is the representation of the hero’s spiritual and religious progression. Each episode in the journey, his encounter with the goddess and the three creatures, his transformation into Wairocana on the summit of Mount Meru and his marriage with the princess Candrawati, represent stages in his progression. Furthermore, the climax of the story, in which the hero Sutasoma finally exorcizes Poruṣāda from the possession of the god Siwa and embedded in the main narrative. For instance, the sage Sumitra tells about the origin of the man-eater Poruṣāda (21.1–23.5). What we have to say here regarding the main narrative also applies to the secondary narrative.

3 Representing metaphysical knowledge in the form of narrative is a commonly used mode in Buddhist and Hindu literature in India as well as in Java. It must be pointed out that the apparently non-narrative treatise Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan, which is highly theoretical and systematic in content, also utilizes a narrative form as its overall framework in a similar fashion to a Christian catechism. The text begins with the statement of the teacher, who is the narrator: “Here I will teach the holy Kamahāyānikan to you, a member of the Tathāgata family, a son of the Jina, a novice. I will teach you the holy Mahāyāna” (Nihan sang hyang Kamahāyānikan ya warahakna mami ri kita ng tathāgatakula jinaputra adhikarmika, sang hyang Mahāyāna, ya ta warahakna mami ri kita) (a25). The text is then interspersed with humble requests from the disciple, who is listening to the teaching, such as: “My great Honourable’s teachings are true. In the end of sacred texts on tarka (logic), wyakarana (grammar), tantra and so on, what is the name of the suitable sacred text, to be adhered to by your servant? May the boon descend [on me], of my splendid great Honourable, who is the god to [me, who is] the servant at the two feet of my splendid great Honourable” (Singgih warah-warah mahāmpungku. Ry awasāna ning aji tarka wyākarana tantrādi, mapa pwekang aji yogya ngaran ikā, anung gēgōnēn ing pinakanghulun, turunan(ni) warāṇugraha ārya mahāmpungku, ya tika hyang ning hulun ri pādadwaya ārya mahāmpungku) (a27).
pacifies the god Kāla, also clearly indicates the religious message: the supremacy of the Buddha over the Hindu god Śiva.

Although the foregoing examples may give an impression that understanding religious aspects of the narrative is only a matter of retrieving religious elements from different facets of narrative, it is in fact a more complicated process, in particular in the case of the first two points (narrator’s description and character’s speech), for their reliability depends on their status in the narrative. In this regard, narratologists have made a useful distinction between “focalization” and “narration”. According to them, we must make “an explicit distinction between, on the one hand, the vision through which the elements [of the story] are presented and, on the other hand, the identity of the voice that is verbalizing that vision” (Bal 1985: 100–1). In other words, in analyzing a narrative, a distinction must be made between “those who see” (focalizer) and “those who speak” (narrator). Focalization is further divided into external and internal, according to its position relative to the story (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 74–8). When focalization is external to the story, the agent who focalizes coincides with the narrator, who may be then called “narrator-focalizer”. A narrator-focalizer is positioned outside the represented world, thus enabling him to have a view which is panoramic and panchronic. As we have seen in the opening stanzas of the Sutasoma narrative, a panoramic and panchronic view often appears “in the beginning or end of a narrative or of one of scenes”, providing a broad picture of the situation (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 77). The position of internal focalization on the other hand is inside the represented world and its focalizer is one of the characters, who may be called “character-focalizer”. Thus a character-focalizer’s perception is limited to the space and time in which the character is situated, and hence its reliability varies depending on the character’s reliability.

The division between external and internal focalization is by no means fixed. In the Sutasoma narrative, although the narrator-focalizer is predominant, focalization can shift between the narrator-focalizer and several character-focalizers, thus giving rise to a difference, or sometimes conflicts, of perceptions. For instance, although the
narrator–focalizer sees the hero Sutasoma as the incarnation of Wairocana and narrates the story accordingly, other character–focalizers do not necessarily see him in the same way. The hero himself considers himself as no more than the prince of the kingdom of Hastina until he transfigures himself into Wairocana on Mount Meru (30.10–11). In the forest the elephant-headed monster Gajawaktra takes the hero to be the god Viṣṇu, who comes to him to challenge his power, and boasts of his superior power to that of Viṣṇu (30.7). Then a group of celestial nymphs, who descend to Mount Meru to seduce Sutasoma, appreciate mainly the beauty of the hero’s appearance, seeing him as “the god of the flowers [the love god Kāma] in contemplation, wishing to descend amid the beauty of the fourth season [kārtika]” (lwir hyang kusumāsamādhi mahārepi turunana ri kalangwan ing kapāt) (48.1). On the other hand, the gods, who appear in front of Sutasoma’s manifestation as Wairocana, praise him by describing him variously as Paramēśvara, as Śiwa, as Śakyumuni, as Wairocana, as Pātañjala, as Wājisvara, as Smara and as the future Girinātha. While it is relatively easy to discard the perceptions of Gajawaktra and the nymphs as limited and unreliable, what the gods see in Sutasoma, because of their broader perception, needs to be accounted for, as we shall do later.4

It is clear from some of the examples given above that what has been said about focalization has a direct bearing upon the status of what is said by characters, for speech is nothing less than the reflection of what a character perceives. The problem of the reliability of a particular character is critical, in particular when the speech involves

4 Apart from the hero’s identity, the description of the landscape is also influenced by the focalizer. For instance, when Sutasoma undertakes a journey to the summit of Mount Meru, the landscape of the mountain is described mostly as hazardous, symbolizing the obstacles to his spiritual progress. Once he reaches the summit and engages in meditation, there is no mention of the landscape at all, for it does not attract his attention. However, we are told that the summit is in reality full of natural beauty, when the nymphs descend on the mountain and their beauty is compared with that of the mountain (43.7–9). This indicates that the focalizer shifts from Sutasoma to the nymphs as the scene changes in the narrative.
complex ideological facets of the narrative, such as religious ideas. Rimmon-Kenan asserts in this regard that:

[The ideological] facet, often referred to as ‘the norms of the text’, consists of ‘a general system of viewing the world conceptually’, in accordance with which the events and characters of the story are evaluated. In the simplest case, the ‘norms’ are presented through a single dominant perspective, that of the narrator–focalizer. If additional ideologies emerge in such texts, they become subordinate to the dominant focalizer, thus transforming the other evaluating subjects into objects of evaluation. Put differently, the ideology of the narrator–focalizer is usually taken as authoritative, and all other ideologies in the text are evaluated from this ‘higher’ position.

In a complex narrative, such as the Sutasoma kakawin, “the single authoritative external focalizer gives way to a plurality of ideological positions whose validity is doubtful in principle” (Rimmon-Kenan 1983: 81). Some of these positions may not agree with the narrator–focalizer’s view and often may even be mutually contradictory. This interplay between different perceptions in a narrative leads to what Bakhtin calls a “polyphonic” reading of the text, in which “the direct and fully weighted signifying power of the characters’ words destroys the monologic plane of the novel and calls forth an unmediated response—as if the character were not an object of authorial discourse, but rather a fully valid, autonomous carrier of his own individual word” (Bakhtin 1984: 5). Although, unlike the narrator–focalizer of modern novels, about which Bakhtin is mainly concerned, the narrator–focalizer of the kakawin narrative does not completely abandon control over the dominant perspective, there are occasions when several character–focalizers present their own voices on such contentious issues as the moral and ethical duty of the prince and engage in “dialogue”. Thus it is vital in understanding the religious aspect of the Sutasoma narrative to recognize the potentially “polyphonic” nature of meaning and to understand how the voices interplay.
Genesis of the Sutasoma Story

The story of the devout Buddhist prince Sutasoma and his pacification of the man-eater originates from early Indian Buddhist literature and is found in a number of variant forms in Indian and Chinese texts. The story had become in all probability part of the horizon of expectation of Javanese society when the Sutasoma kakawin was composed, for there is sufficient evidence to believe that the story had been current inside and outside ancient Javanese society since around the eighth century. It is depicted as a part of the series of the Jātakamāla reliefs in Canṣi Borobudur, construction of which is thought to have started in the late eighth century and finished in the early ninth century. Apart from the Borobudur reliefs, Heine-Gerden has drawn attention to the fact that a motif for the carved figures of sword-hilts used by people of the island of Nias, which may date back to about the fourteenth century or earlier, is taken from the Sutasoma story (1972: 312). He has also found that two kinds of motifs for Batak sword-hilts are also derived from the Sutasoma story. One displays the demon carrying Sutasoma and the other "the giant animal-headed ogre squatting behind the standing Sutasoma, ready to devour him" (1972: 318). The former motif may be related to another interesting artifact, a golden ornament depicting the prince Sutasoma being carried by the demon, which, although its location of origin is not known, is considered to originate from the fourteenth or fifteenth century (Zoetmulder 1974: plate 14). Although the spread of the Sutasoma story to Sumatra and Nias may have been due to the possible popularity of the Sutasoma kakawin there, it is more likely, at least as far as the motif of the abduction of Sutasoma is concerned, that the motifs were inspired by the Borobudur reliefs. In the first place there is a

5 The Sutasoma story is shown in four panels, that is, panel 116 to 119 on the top row of the balustrade on the first gallery. Panel 116 depicts a brahman coming to Sutasoma, panel 117 Sutasoma being carried off by the man-eater, panel 118 Sutasoma hearing teachings from the brahman and panel 119 Sutasoma preaching to the man-eater (Krom 1927: vol.1, 384-7).
general resemblance between the two and in the second the scene of the abduction is found in the reliefs but not in the kakawin.

Although these artifacts give us a clue about the existence of the story in a certain period of time, to understand the genesis of the Sutasoma story as it is in the kakawin, we have to turn to Indian Buddhist literature.\(^6\) It is Kern who first drew attention to the relationship between the Sutasoma kakawin and the Sutasoma stories in Indian Buddhist literature, in particular in the Sanskrit Jātakamālā and the Pāli Jātaka, the two famous collections of stories recounting the exploits of the Buddha while he was still a bodhisattva (1912: 145–6). Kern dismisses the possibility of these jātaka stories being used as the model for the kakawin on the ground that the genealogy of the man-eater in the kakawin is unique to it and that there are elements of Tantric Buddhism, such as Wairocana, in the kakawin. Thus he conjectures that the author Tantular must have used an unknown “Northern Buddhist” text, that is, a Mahāyāna text in Sanskrit with, by implication, Tantric inclinations, as the model for his kakawin. To support his contention, Kern pointed to the fact that the author–narrator of the Sutasoma kakawin states in stanza 1.4 that his “composition is derived from the boddhakāwya” (ginēlar sangka ring boddhakāwya), and argued that the word “boddhakāwya” should be interpreted as the name of the particular text which Tantular used as the model but is unknown to us (1888: 166). Soewito-Santoso, on the other hand, argues that the word “boddhakāwya” should be understood as a story or stories about the Buddha in general,\(^7\) and that the author of the kakawin had in mind in particular the Sutasoma jātaka story “found on the walls of the Borobudur” as the frame story into which other jātaka stories and episodes from epic stories were

---

\(^6\) The present author has made a detailed study on the Indian origin of the story of the Sutasoma kakawin in Aoyama (1986). This section draws on the results of that study.

\(^7\) Zoetmulder’s definition supports Soewito-Santoso: “a poem about (in praise of?) the Buddha” (Zoetmulder 1982: 249).
inserted (1975: 36–8). Although his assumption of a link between the Sutasoma kakawin and the Borobudur reliefs is, as we shall see, unfounded, his argument for the jātaka story as the framework of the kakawin is still worth pursuing. To evaluate Kern’s and Soewito-Santoso’s assertions further, it will be necessary to consider not only the Jātakamālā and the Jātaka but the whole group of the Buddhist texts which recount the story of Sutasoma.

It has been known that outside the Indonesian archipelago there are no less than twenty Buddhist texts in Pāli, Sanskrit and Chinese translation which recount the story of the prince Sutasoma and his pacification of the man-eater king (Watanabe 1909: 240–1). Although each story narrated in the texts shares the same basic theme of the pacification of the man-eater by the hero, its length and details vary from one text to another. I shall take into consideration eleven texts, excluding those which only allude to the story or which appear to be the summary or translation of another text. They are listed below together with their abbreviations in a parenthesis: 

Pāli texts: 

Jātaka, episode no. 513, Jayaddisajātaka (J 513)
Jātaka, episode no. 537, Mahāsutasomajātaka (J 537)

Sanskrit texts:

Jātakamālā, episode no. 31 (Jm 31)
Bhadrakalpāvadāna, episode no. 34 (Bh 34)

Some of the texts are from a collection of jātaka stories, in which case the number of the particular episode which recounts the story of Sutasoma is given. As for the Pāli jātaka texts, the individual titles of the episodes are also indicated.

9 See Fausbøll (1877) for the Pāli texts.

10 See Kern (1891) for the Jātakamālā and d’Oldenberg (1893) for the Bhadrakalpāvadāna.
Chinese texts:¹¹

Liu-du-ji-jing, episode no. 41 (T 152)
Shi-zi-su-tuo-po-duan-rou-jing (T 164)
Seng-qi-luo-suo-ji-jing (T 194)
Xian-yu-jing, episode no. 52 (T 202)
Za-pi-yu-jing, episode no. 8 (T 205)
Jiu-za-pi-yu-jing, episode no. 40 (T 206)
Da-zhi-du-lun (T 1509)

These variants of the story can be classified according to the structure of the theme. The Sutasoma story in its ideal form appears to consist of the combination of two themes: The first theme (theme A) is about Sutasoma’s pacification of the man-eater. In this theme the story is told from Sutasoma’s point of view and attention is not paid to the man-eater, as is clear from the following diagram in which the theme is divided into three episodes (a1, a2 and a3):

Theme A: Sutasoma pacifies the man-eater

a1: Sutasoma is captured by the man-eater, preventing him from fulfilling the promise he has made to reward a brahman for the preaching.

a2: Having convinced the man-eater of his sincerity, Sutasoma is allowed to go to see the brahman on the condition that he come back to the man-eater.

a3: Impressed by Sutasoma’s return, the man-eater is finally pacified.

The second theme (theme B) on the other hand tells why a certain king becomes a man-eater. In contrast to theme A, the story is now told from the man-eater’s point of view. The theme is further classified into two sub-themes (B1 and B2): Theme B1 explains his cannibal character as a congenital trait, whereas theme B2 explains it as an acquired trait. Although the two themes can be separately narrated, in some texts theme B1 is connected to B2, recounting that his potential nature becomes manifest as a result of a certain event after his birth. Theme B2 typically consists of three episodes (b1, b2

and b3), although there are a few texts which have a less clear plot structure, which is marked as B'2:

Theme B: Origin of the man-eater

B1: Cannibal habit as a congenital trait
A king, lost in a forest, is forced to have intercourse with a lioness. As a consequence the lioness gives birth to a boy, who later succeeds his father as king. Later he becomes a man-eater, as his beastly nature manifests itself, or because of a cause recounted in theme B2 or B'2.

B2: Cannibal habit as an acquired trait
b1: A king becomes a man-eater for some reason (typically because of the cook's use of human flesh for a dish).
b2: Being in danger, the man-eater vows to a certain deity that he will sacrifice a certain number (typically one hundred) of kings if he is saved from danger.
b3: In some stories, the deity rejects the sacrifice of the captured kings and demands the sacrifice of Sutasoma.

B'2: Cannibal habit as an acquired trait, without the clear structure of b1 and b2.

An important point to be noticed is that although theme A alone may be enough to make the story called a Sutasoma story, theme B alone cannot constitute a Sutasoma story as such, for the theme itself does not lead the story to the solution of the pacification of the man-eater. Thus, when theme B is present in the story, theme B2, in particular the episode of the capture of kings (b2), or sometimes B'2, necessarily connects the themes A and B in such a way that the capture of kings leads to the capture of Sutasoma himself. Table 4.1 shows how the themes are distributed among the texts. It is apparent from the table that the only element that the kakawin shares with the other texts is theme B2. Since, then, there is no Sutasoma story in the Indian texts which consists of theme B2 alone, it is logical to assume that theme B2 in the kakawin was derived from a text with the A+[B1]+B2 pattern, that is, J 537, Jm 31,
Table 4.1 Distribution of the Themes in the Sutasoma Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sutasoma <em>kakawin</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 513</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 537</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jm 31</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bh 34</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 152</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 164</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 194</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 202</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 205</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 206</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1509</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T 152, T 164 or T 205. However, the table also suggests that, although the *kakawin* does tell the story of the pacification of the man-eater by the hero Sutasoma, the way it is told cannot have been derived from the Indian texts.

Nevertheless, further comparison of the structure of theme B2 will enable us to see which particular Indian text is the closest to the *kakawin*. Table 4.2 shows the cause of the king’s becoming the man-eater (b1), why the man-eater vows to what deity to sacrifice how many of kings (b2), and whether the deity rejects the captured kings and instead asks for Sutasoma (b3), as described in J 537, Jm 31, T 152, T 164 and T 205. The table clearly illustrates the connection between the Sutasoma *kakawin* and the Pāli Mahāsutasomajātaka (J 537). Episode b1 of the *kakawin* recounts the incident which eventually awakens the king’s demonic nature thus:

22.6 . . . / There was a cook who was preparing a dish to please [the taste of] the monarch. / Suddenly the dish disappeared, carried off by a well-bred dog. / He went out to look for a substitute, took part of the thigh of a human corpse and cooked it.
4.2 Comparison of the Structure of Theme B2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Cause of cannibal habit</th>
<th>Man-eater's vow to capture kings</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>Sacrifice</th>
<th>Deity's rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sut.</td>
<td>A dog steals the king's meal. The cook takes flesh from the thigh of a corpse and cooks it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery from injury</td>
<td>Kāla</td>
<td>One hundred kings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 537</td>
<td>A dog steals the king's meal. The cook takes flesh from the thigh of a corpse and cooks it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery from injury</td>
<td>Tree goddess</td>
<td>One hundred kings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jm 31</td>
<td>(Not specified)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape from danger</td>
<td>Bhūta</td>
<td>One hundred kings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 152</td>
<td>The king's cook loses the meat. He takes flesh from a corpse and cooks it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resumption of the throne</td>
<td>Tree god</td>
<td>One hundred kings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 164</td>
<td>A dog steals the king's meal. The cook captures and cooks a child.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition of the ability to fly</td>
<td>Mountain god</td>
<td>One hundred kings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 205</td>
<td>The cook is ordered by the king to capture and cook a man.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resumption of the throne</td>
<td>Tree god</td>
<td>Five hundred kings</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrences of a dog's stealing the food and of the cook's cutting flesh from the thigh of a corpse are peculiar to the *kakawin* and the *jātaka*. Moreover, episode b2 of both the *kakawin* and the *jātaka* also recounts a similar incident in which the man-eater injures his foot, prays to a deity for the recovery from the injury and vows to sacrifice one hundred kings if his wish is granted. Only the identity of the deities are different in the two texts: Kāla in the *kakawin* and the tree goddess in the *jātaka*. Finally, episode b3, which also occur only in these two texts, is crucial in determining the

---

12 Ensink has also pointed out similarities in episodes b1 and b2 (1967: 59, note 3; 61, note 30a).
character of the story, because of the fact that the deity prefers Sutasoma to the hundred captured kings establishes the hero’s undeniable excellence over other kings.\(^\text{13}\) In the other texts, which lack this episode, Sutasoma is merely one of the captured kings. Thus, although his final victory over the man-eater remains unquestioned, his supremacy is not overtly signalled.\(^\text{14}\)

Thus, although it has not been established how and when the Pāli Buddhist texts might have been transmitted to Java, it seems clear from the foregoing argument that Tantular borrowed certain elements from the Pāli Mahāsutasomajātaka (J 537). Kern’s contention that the *kakawin* was modeled on a “Northern Buddhist” text now appears to be questionable not only because it is undeniable that some elements in the *kakawin* were taken from the Pāli Buddhist text but also because it seems improbable to assume the existence of an unknown Buddhist text on which the *kakawin* might have been directly modeled, considering the plot structure of the Sutasoma story in the known Indian Buddhist texts. On the other hand Soewito-Santoso’s assertion that

\(^\text{13}\) However, the motives of the two deities for demanding Sutasoma are completely different. The tree goddess in the *jātaka*, who has actually nothing to do with the man-eater’s recovery from the injury, is so anxious about the safety of the captured innocent kings that she asks the man-eater to capture Sutasoma in the hope that the latter can save their lives. On the other hand, the god Kāla in the *kakawin* refuses the captured kings and asks for Sutasoma because he thinks that none of the kings is as good food as Sutasoma (111.1). Interestingly enough, however, in the end, after being pacified, the god Kāla confesses that the real reason he wanted to see Sutasoma is not to devour him but to have him as a teacher in the hope that Sutasoma can deliver him from sins (ndan agurwa don ta kaharēpku lumukata ri pāpa ni nghulun) (144.6). A similar theme is found in the *kidung* Sudamala, in which the goddess Uma in the form of a demon summons the hero Sadewa to exorcize herself.

\(^\text{14}\) Probably other evidence suggestive of the connection between the Sutasoma *kakawin* and the Mahāsutasomajātaka is the fact that Brahmadattakumāra appears as the son of the king of Kāsi in the latter, and not in other Indian texts. Then it does not seem to be a coincidence that Daśabāhu, the son of the king of Kāsi is the son granted by the god Brahmā (*brahmadatta*). In addition, it should be noticed that the Mahāsutasomajātaka, but also the Jātakamālā as well, links the hero Sutasoma genealogically with the Kaurawa (Korawa) as in the Sutasoma *kakawin*. 
Tantular created a new story by using Mahāsutasomajātaka as “the frame work” into which he inserted motifs from Buddhist texts and the Hindu epics is quite conceivable, although his attempt to link the *kakawin* with the Borobudur reliefs is groundless, for the Sutasoma story depicted in the Borobudur reliefs are based on the Sanskrit Jātakamālā, which, as we have seen, has no direct connection with the *kakawin*.

However, the term “frame work” of the *kakawin* which Soewito-Santoso applies to the Pāli Mahāsutasomajātaka needs to be qualified. In fact the elements from the Pāli *jātaka* do not constitute the “frame”, for they do not determine the basic plot structure nor the main theme of the *kakawin*. As we have seen, the *kakawin* story characteristically lacks theme A, which means that the main implication of the story in the *jātaka* as well as many other Indian texts is not retained in the *kakawin*. The main theme in Indian texts emphasizes sincerity, which is dramatically illustrated by two events in the Pāli *jātaka*: when captured, the hero successfully persuades the man-eater to let him go home so that he can keep his promise to reward a brahman for his teachings, on condition that he will return to the man-eater. Then, after abdicating the throne, he returns to the man-eater to keep his new promise. Sutasoma’s sincerity impresses the man-eater greatly and finally causes him to repent.15 By contrast, the theme of sincerity is not at issue in the *kakawin*.16 Tantular, therefore, while taking

15 Every Pāli *jātaka* text is written basically in prose, interspersed with several verses, which are considered to preserve the archaic and central part of the story. That sincerity is the main theme of the Mahāsutasomajātaka is evident from the fact that it is represented in the verse part of the text (Kono 1982).

16 Tambiah points out another aspect of the Mahāsutasomajātaka, the denunciation and devaluation of the Hindu *kṣatriya* ethic. According to him, in this *jātaka* story “a virtuous prince [Sutasoma] repudiates the duties of the *kṣatriya* as being contrary to morality and keeps his plighted word to a man-eating monster”. In this way “the Buddhist view advocates reciprocity as against self-interest, and an ‘unqualified supremacy of the moral law over governmental affairs’ in contradistinction to that brand of arthasāstric thought that recommends the objective of maximum advantage to the ruler and his policy” (Tambiah 1976: 32). The point,
some elements from the *jātaka*, was concerned more to construct a new story set in the *kakawin*-like setting with a new theme. In this process, while the episodes from theme A are entirely replaced by a new life story of the hero, which is modelled on the life story of the Buddha, a few elements from theme B2 are embedded in this new framework.

**Sutasoma Story and the Buddha’s Life Story**

**Buddha’s Life Story as the Model**

As Soewito-Santoso points out, there are undeniable similarities between the life story of the Buddha and the life story of the prince Sutasoma. He enumerates six episodes which appear in the both stories:

1. descent from heaven
2. childhood and youth in the palace
3. escape from the palace to the forest
4. wandering and visits to ascetics
5. meditation
6. sermon

Although these six episodes cover only the first half part of the life stories of the Buddha and Sutasoma, they clearly indicate that the both stories are concerned about which we may call a tension between Hindu *kṣatriya* ethic of “world maintainer” and Buddhist ethic of “world renouncer”, will be discussed later.

17 The Buddha in this context means the “historical” Buddha, who is also called Siddhārtha (as a child), Gautama (as an ascetic, after his clan’s name) and Śākyamuni (the sage of the Śākya tribe). The word “Buddha”, however, can be applied to anyone who is “enlightened”. These two meanings should also be distinguished from so-called “transcendental” Buddha, such as Wairocana and Aksobhya. Nevertheless I shall use the word “Buddha” for these three categories provided that the context makes the meaning clear.

18 The six episodes are quoted, with some modification, from Soewito-Santoso (1975: 37).
the life course of the hero who seeks the true knowledge and in doing so undergoes changes of identity from prince through ascetic to enlightenment. Thus, it can be said that the both stories are narrated in “Platonic time” as the dominant chronotope. A close investigation, however, reveals that there is a fundamental difference between the two stories.

The life story of the Buddha was known in ancient Javanese society since at the latest around the eighth century, for it is depicted on the reliefs of Candi Borobudur. The story represented in the reliefs is based on the Sanskrit Buddhist text Lalitavistara, a typical account of the Buddha’s life story up to his first sermon. Since we now know that the Sutasoma jātaka story depicted on the Borobudur reliefs is not directly connected to the kakawin, we should be prudent when linking the Buddha’s life story on the Borobudur reliefs and Sutasoma’s life story. Nevertheless this does not mean we should not use the Lalitavistara as an exemplary account of the life of the Buddha which might have been known in ancient Javanese society. Our aim here is not to establish the Lalitavistara or any particular text as a direct literary source of the Sutasoma’s life story, but to investigate the religious conditions which informed the life story of Sutasoma, and by doing so to elucidate a fundamental difference from the life story of Sutasoma and that of the Buddha in spite of their apparent similarity.

1) Descent from Heaven

According to the Lalitavistara, the Buddha chooses of his own accord to descend from the Tuṣita heaven to the earth to be born as Siddhārtha, the crown prince of the kingdom of the Śākya tribe. This life is to be the last of his innumerable incarnations as the bodhisattwa, the seeker of the ultimate truth (bodhi) through

19 The story is depicted in the hundred twenty panels on the top row of the main wall on the first gallery (Krom 1927).

20 For the story of the Lalitavistara as depicted on the Borobudur reliefs, I draw on Krom (1974). For other Buddhist texts recounting the life story of Buddha, see Foucher (1963).
benevolent deeds. His exploits as the bodhisattwa in previous lives, including the one as the prince Sutasoma, are recounted in the jātaka stories. His last life is not different from his previous lives in the sense that when he is born as the prince, he is still the bodhisattwa. The difference, however, lies in the fact that this time he is destined to attain bodhi and to become the Enlightened One (Buddha) so that he will not be reborn in the world of suffering. His destiny is attested by a sage’s prophecy that he will become either the Buddha or the Universal Monarch (Cakrawartin), because he has on his body the thirty-two notable and eighty subtle physical marks, which only appear on the Buddha or the Cakrawartin.

Unlike the Buddha, the birth of Sutasoma is not initiated by himself but is invoked by his father (1.5–2.1). A brahman advises to the childless king of Hastina that only the crown prince can save the whole world from the demon’s threat. When the king engages in meditation in the shrine of the Buddha statue in the hope of obtaining a favour from the Jinendra (Wairocana), he is informed by the Buddha that he will have a son. Soon Wairocana descends to the earth to be born as the king’s son Sutasoma. The pattern of this episode, that is, an incarnation of the deity as the response to a childless king’s invocation, appears to be more Hindu than Buddhist. In fact, a similar episode is found in the Rāmāyaṇa kakawin, in which the childless king Daśaratha performs a sacrifice in order that he may be granted a child. In response to this, the god Wiṣṇu incarnates himself as the king’s son Rāma, who is to kill the demon king Rāvana (Zoetmulder 1974: 217). Thus, the ontological status of Sutasoma, who is not the bodhisattwa, an aspirant to become the Buddha, but the

---

21 The Buddha who communicates with the king is called “bodhisattwa” (1.9), but the term should not be understood in the sense it is used in the jātaka stories, for the same Buddha is referred to as the Lord Buddha (bhaṭṭara Buddha) in a later stanza (8.5). According to Zoetmulder, in Old Javanese literature the word “bodhisattwa” appears only in the Sutasoma kakawin and it “does not differ in meaning from Buddha and Jina. The idea of ‘being destined for enlightenment, destined to become a Buddha’ is not found here” (1982: 250).
incarnation of the Buddha, is closer to that of the god Wiṣṇu, who resolves to descend on the earth from time to time to save the world from evil.

2) Childhood and Youth in the Palace

Both Siddhārtha and Sutasoma are carefully groomed to become kings. The both excel others in every field of education. When the prince Siddhārtha becomes marriageable, his father suggests that he marry in the hope that marriage will ensure that he remains in the palace and becomes the Cakrawartin instead of leaving the palace to become the Buddha. The prince duly marries and begets a son. Thus he fulfills one of the duties prescribed in the Hindu law, that is, one should “take a wife and found a family, raising up sons so that his line may continue and so that there will be someone to perform his funeral rites when he is dead” (Zaehner 1966: 111). The birth of a son is not another bond to tie Siddhārtha to the temporal life, but is rather a prerequisite for him to leave the palace, for only after fulfilling the duty of a householder can he enter the religious life (Zaehner 1966: 113). By contrast, Sutasoma refuses to marry, despite his father’s advice to do so, arguing that his only desire is to go to a mountain and engage in meditation to attain salvation (mokṣa). Thus, while the Buddha reconciles the duty of a married householder and the ideal of a celibate ascetic by fulfilling the former first and then attaining the latter, Sutasoma persists in the ideal of asceticism. It is only after he obtains the ultimate wisdom that Sutasoma realizes that there is no conflict between the life of a householder and that of a ascetic in the light of Tantric Buddhism, and returns to the palace.

3) Escape from the Palace to the Forest and 4) Wandering and Visits to the Ascetics

Prince Siddhārtha finally departs the palace and becomes Gautama, the wandering ascetic in the forest. He stays in this stage for many years, during which he

22 Although, quite curiously, the Buddha’s son is not depicted in the Borobudur reliefs (Krom 1974), I mention him here, because not only does he appear in many Buddhist texts (Foucher 1963), but I wish to point out the implication of the fact that the Buddha has a son.
studies under other ascetics and performs severe penance, until he engages in the final meditation in which he obtains the ultimate truth. On the other hand, Sutasoma, instructed by the Buddhist goddess, immediately sets out on a journey to the summit of Mount Meru, where he wishes to meditate, although there are several significant episodes during the journey, which we shall discuss in the following section.

4) Meditation and 5) Sermon

The episode of the Buddha’s attainment of enlightenment consists of a series of events. When he is engaged in meditation on the bank of the River Nairaṅjanā, the army of the Evil One (Māra) attacks him, but the assaults are all rendered harmless by the Buddha’s great power. Then Māra challenges the Buddha’s claim that as the bodhisattwa he has made innumerable sacrifices for the benefit of other beings because of his aspiration to obtain enlightenment. By touching the earth, the Buddha summons the goddess of earth as witness. She appears before him and testifies to his claim. 23 Māra then asks his three daughters to seduce the Buddha by using all kinds of feminine allurement, but their temptation fails to tempt him. Having defeated Māra, the

---

23 There is a curious allusion to the Buddha’s life story in the Sutasoma kakawin. When Sutasoma sojourns at the sage Sumitra’s hermitage, the sages try to dissuade him from going to Mount Meru, but he remains resolute in his intention. Suddenly the goddess of earth (bhaṭāri sang hyang ning kṣīti) appears and tells him that he should have compassion for the world and become the king because in the kaliyuga only the incarnation of the Buddha can save the world. Then she disappears. The sages cheerfully approve her words, but Sutasoma pays no heed to her, thinking that she is the “deceit by magic” (māyābāñcana) (26.1–28.1). Does this mean that Sutasoma is an unreliable character–focalizer who cannot perceive the right intention of the earth goddess, or rather the goddess is an unreliable character–focalizer who cannot see through the Sutasoma’s destiny? Moreover it is curious why the earth goddess, who plays such an important role of testifying the Buddha’s great compassion in the life story of the Buddha, has to be flatly discredited in the Sutasoma narrative. However, later in stanza 54.4 the goddess of the earth briefly appears again in a role which is more in accordance with her role in the Buddha’s life story. When on the summit of Mound Meru the gods plead with Sutasoma for compassion, she (hyang nikang bhūmi, this time) is found among a group of monks who support the gods’ plea.
Buddha finally attains the highest wisdom (*dharma*). Initially, however, the Buddha is inclined not to reveal the highest wisdom, because he has some doubt whether his teaching is properly understood by others. It is the gods Brahmā and Indra who come to him and persuade him to reveal the highest wisdom to others for their benefit. The Buddha agrees to this and goes to the city of Vāraṇasi, where he delivers his first sermon to the five disciples.

Although he is not subjected to violence, Sutasoma too has to endure the temptation of feminine allurement by celestial nymphs while meditating on Mount Meru, before he attains his ultimate goal, that is, identity with the Supreme Buddha Wairrocana. However, the episode resembles more a Hindu story than the life story of the Buddha, for it is in fact the god Indra who orders the nymphs to seduce Sutasoma in order that he leaves his meditation and returns to the kingdom to become the king who protects the world from the demon. The seduction of an ascetic, engaged in meditation, by one or more celestial nymphs, masterminded by the god Indra for various reasons, is a popular one in both Hindu and Old Javanese literature. A typical instance is found in the *kakawin* Arjunawiwaha, in which the hero Arjuna, engaged in meditation on Mount Indrakila, is visited by celestial nymphs. They are ordered by Indra to seduce him using their charms in order to prove whether his spiritual power is strong enough to resist temptation and thus to overpower the menacing demon Niwātakawaca, who cannot be killed either by gods or demons. Arjuna passes the test and is granted by Śiwa a magical weapon as a reward. In the *kakawin* Smaradahana, on the other hand, it is not a nymph but the love god Kāma, although he too is responsible for arousing amorous desire, who is sent to distract the god Śiwa from penance on Mount Meru and to arouse his desire for his spouse Umā in order that they have a child, who is to kill the demon Nilarudraka. Śiwa succumbs to Kāma's allurement and leaves his meditation to engage in love-making with his consort.24

---

24 Another *kakawin* which contains the theme of seduction is the *kakawin* Sumanasāntaka. In this *kakawin* the celestial nymphs Harini is ordered by Indra to
While the seduction of Arjuna is to test his spiritual power, the seduction of Śiwa is, like the seduction of Sutasoma, to bring him back to the life of householder. But this distinction is ambiguous, for the seduction of Sutasoma is closer to that of Arjuna than to that of Śiwa in that in neither case is the the hero’s meditation discontinued. Sutasoma does withstand the seduction, against Indra’s intention, and by doing so proves himself worthy of attaining the ultimate truth. However, Sutasoma’s transfiguration to Wairocana allows the god Indra to worships him with a hymn of praise and to plead with him to return to the kingdom for the well-being of the whole world, which Sutasoma duly agrees to. If Sutasoma succumbed to temptation, as Śiwa does in the Smaradahana, he would not be worthy of Wairocana, thus proving himself to be incapable of pacifying the demon.

Like Indra and Brahmā in the life story of the Buddha, Indra acts as a catalyst who brings the hero, who has attained the ultimate truth, back to this world so that others will benefit. Thus the two principal pillars of Buddhism, the wisdom to enlighten oneself (prajñā) and the compassion to enlighten others (karuṇā) (Nagao 1973: 25), are embodied in the Buddha and Sutasoma. However, unlike the Buddha, who comes back to this world to preach and establish the sangha (Buddhist monastic order), Sutasoma comes back to this world to become the householder, king, and protector of the world, in other words, as the Cakrawartin, but does so without forfeiting his identity as Wairocana. Therefore, while the Buddha becomes the Buddha by rejecting the possibility of becoming the Cakrawartin, Sutasoma integrates the two identities into himself and thus becomes the Buddha–Cakrawartin.

seduce the brahman Troawindu to interrupt his severe penance, the intensity of which has made even the gods afraid of his power. Unlike the Arjunawiwaha and the Smaradahana, however, it is not the interruption of the penance itself but a curse cast by the brahman on Harini that has a consequence in the story.
The Theory of *Buddha-kāya*

There are two fundamental religious conditions which underlie the difference between the life story Buddha and that of Sutasoma. The one is a difference in the notion of Buddha body (*buddha-kāya*) and the other is the Tantric Buddhism of the Sutasoma narrative. We shall discuss the former here, while the latter will be discussed in the following section where it is more appropriate.

According to Nagao (1973), the theory of *buddha-kāya* evolved from the theory of the twofold body in the early Buddhist texts, including several Mahāyāna texts, to the theory of the threefold body in the later Buddhist texts, including Tantric Buddhist texts. The theory of twofold body distinguishes between *rūpa-kāya* and *dharma-kāya*. The historical Buddha, who was born with a physical body in this temporal world, is called *rūpa-kāya*, whereas his teachings were immortalized as the body of the eternal truth, called *dharma-kāya*. Since the law of transmigration (*sārīśāra*), the eternal recycle of birth and death, was an indisputable assumption of Indian thought, even the Buddha himself was not an exception to this law, at least until he was born as Siddhārtha and became enlightened, thus liberating himself from the cycle. Thus it was natural for the Buddhist to think that the historical Buddha’s great achievement became possible only after the accumulation of merit in innumerable lives in the past as the *bodhisattva*, the seeker of enlightenment. The *jātaka* stories were thus created to recount the numerous deeds of the Buddha as the *bodhisattva*, whose attributes are the vow to emancipate all sentient beings and the discipline with which he fulfills the vow.

One of the consequences of the notion of the *bodhisattva*’s transmigration was that, if even the Buddha himself had lived the lives of ordinary creatures for innumerable cycles of life, any living creature had a possibility of becoming a Buddha in future after acting out the ideal of *bodhisattva* for many lives. From this line of thought, on the one hand, emerged a number of *bodhisattva* in the Mahāyāna Buddhist literature, such as Awalokiteśvara, Samantabhadra and Mañjuśrī. Unlike the
bodhisattwa in the jātaka, the Mahāyāna bodhisattwa continue to dwell in the cycle of birth and death. They do so not because of the karma (act) performed in former lives, but because they choose to stay in this world out of great compassion so that they can emancipate more living beings they come across. The possibility of a multitude of bodhisattwa lead therefore to the emergence of a variety of Buddha, who had became enlightened after a long time of practice as a bodhisattwa. For instance, the bodhisattwa Dharmakara is known to have become the Buddha Amitābha (unlimited wisdom) or Amitāyus (unlimited benevolence). Thus it became possible for the Buddhist to think that “Gautama Buddha was not the only Buddha; that there had been many Buddhas in the past, and there would be many Buddhas in the future; and that actually there existed innumerable Buddhas in the innumerable Buddha-lands in the ten directions” (Nagao 1973: 30).

The theory of threefold body came into existence to systematize this new development of the concept of buddha-kāya. According to the theory the three buddha-kāya are called dharma-kāya, sarībhoga-kāya and nirmāṇa-kāya. The dharma-kāya resides in the state of immutable śūnyatā (voidness) or dharma-dhātu (dharma realm). Being abstracted from the historical Buddha’s teachings, it is characterized by its entire abstractness, theoretical nature and absolute immovability. Thus, “as it makes the dharma-dhātu its own being, it can be the foundation and basis for the two other bodies”, but “it transcends human understanding and speculation; it is incognizable, invisible, inconceivable, without color or form” (Nagao 1973: 32). The sarībhoga-kāya (enjoyment body), the second Buddha body, designates the Mahāyāna Buddhas, such as Wairocana, Akṣobhya, Amitābha and Amitāyus, who have fulfilled the bodhisattwa vow and now enjoy the fruit of enlightenment. Being situated in the middle, the sarībhoga-kāya plays a pivotal role as the mediator of the transcendental dharma-kāya and phenomenal nirmāṇa-kāya (Nagao 1973: 36). While the dharma-kāya is absolutely immovable and inconceivable, the sarībhoga-kāya appears in many Buddhist narratives as the Supreme Buddha, in particular as Wairocana in Javanese Buddhist literature. He is also responsible for the transformation of the eternal truth
into the *nirmāṇa-kāya* (Transformation body), the third Buddha body. Equivalent to the *rupa-kāya* in the early theory, the latter designates the Buddha body with a visible and physical body. Here the word “transformation” means not so much the eternal transmigration in the cycle of birth and death as the transformation of the eternal truth into a form of physical existence so that even ordinary creatures can benefit from it. The historical Buddha is the best example of this body, who was “the Buddha from whom his disciples were able face to face to hear the teachings”, whereas the *sambhoga-kāya* is “the Buddha-body that can be seen only by bodhisattvas in the Buddha-land, not by ordinary unenlightened men” (Nagao 1973: 33).  

In this regard the Tibetan Buddhist commentary Mkhas-grub-rje, written in the fifteenth century, provides us with insightful information about the Tantric Buddhist notion of the Buddha body (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 26-7). According to its section on the Yoga Tantra, when Śākyamuni was meditating on the bank of the Naiρāṇjana River the Buddhas of the ten directions aroused him from meditation. They advised him that he could not become a Manifest Complete Buddha (*Sarhaṇyaksarna-buddha*) by the meditation alone. They then took his spiritual body to the Akaniṣṭha heaven (the highest of the material heavens), while his material body stayed at the bank. After being given initiations by the Buddhas of the ten directions, he entered the intense contemplation comprising the five Abhisamā bodhi. After completing the contemplation he became a Manifest Complete Buddha as Mahāwairocana, the *sambhoga-kāya*. However, because the *sambhoga-kāya* is

---

25 It should be noted in this regard that in the *kakawin* Kuṇjarakarṇa Wairocana’s abode is called the “immaculate monastery of Bodhicitta” (wihāra warabodhicittāmala) (6.9) or the “famous monastery called Bodhicitta the Pure” (wihāra prakaśita maṇḍaran Bodhicittatiśuddha) (32.6). Here he delivers sermons to a divine audience. The name “Bodhicitta” suggests that the sermon can be attended by only those who have reached the highest spiritual stage, for “a physical visit to the Lord in his abode and the mystical unification with the Lord” are considered identical (Teeuw et al. 1981: 21).
constrained by five “certainties”,26 the Buddha manifests himself as the nirmāṇa-kāya in various forms. Thus:

After becoming a full Buddha, he performed the four kinds of marvel. His Sarībhoga-kāya remained in the Akanistha heaven. By means of the Nirmāṇa-kāya he performed various acts. For example, with the single apparition (nirmita) of a four-faced Vairocana, he proceeded to the summit of Mt. Sumeru and recited the fundamental Yoga Tantra, Tattavasamgraha. Then he appeared in the world of men [by re-entering the body of Śākyamuni] and displayed the methods of defeating Māra, the Manifest Complete Buddha-hood, and so forth. (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 34–5)

Thus, according to Tantric Buddhism, the Buddha, when he was still the bodhisattva, was first instructed to become Wairocana Buddha with the sarībhoga-kāya, who promulgated the teachings of the Yoga Tantra on Mount Sumeru.27 It is then this Wairocana, who in order to communicate with ordinary beings, transformed himself to the historical Buddha with the nirmāṇa-kāya.

---

26 The sarībhoga-kāya’s five “certainties” are: 1) certainty of place (it does not proceed to any place outside the Akanistha heaven), 2) certainty of doctrine (it proclaims only the Mahāyāna doctrine), 3) certainty of form (it only appears in the form adorned with the thirty-two characteristics and eighty minor marks), 4) certainty of retinue (its retinue consists only of bodhisattva of the tenth stage), and 5) certainty of time (unless the cycle of life (sarīṁśāra) is not depleted of suffering beings, it does not demonstrate the method of entering nirvāṇa) (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 20–3). In the Kuṅjarakarma, the only kakawin narrative apart from the Sutasoma, in which Wairocana appears as a character, Wairocana is depicted as a static and sedentary figure who is only involved in the story by giving teachings to the hero.

27 Meru and Sumeru are in general interchangeable, although there is a tendency for Buddhist tradition to prefer Sumeru while Hindu tradition prefers Meru. In addition, the two traditions set the location of the mountain differently in their cosmographies, but, as we have seen in chapter three, the Sutasoma narrative appears to have adopted the Hindu cosmography in terms of the mountain’s name and location.
The notion of the Buddha in the Sutasoma *kakawin* appears to be in complete accordance with this Tantric notion of Buddha body. Since Wairocana himself, being the *sambhoga-kāya*, cannot appear on earth, his incarnation, the Buddha with the *nirmāṇa-kāya*, is invoked to be born on the earth as the prince Sutasoma, who eliminates evil from the world by preaching the Buddha’s teachings. Thus, in terms of his ontological status, Sutasoma is not a *bodhisattwa*, for he already is the Buddha. However, like his counterpart in the life story of the Buddha, in the narrative he presents himself as the resolute seeker of the ultimate truth. It is in this sense that he also can be called a *bodhisattwa*.28 On the other hand, the episode of Wairocana’s incarnation as Sutasoma bears a considerable resemblance to that of the god Viṣṇu’s incarnation as the prince Rāma.29 There is little reason to doubt that the Rāmāyaṇa story may have influenced, probably through the Rāmāyaṇa *kakawin*, the episode of Wairocana’s incarnation. Nevertheless, the examination of the theory of the threefold body, in particular that of Tantric Buddhism, has indicated that the notion of Wairocana’s incarnation as a physical existence on earth is by no means an import from Hinduism but a genuinely Buddhist concept. Then, to understand further the aspect of the Tantric Buddhism of the Sutasoma narrative, we shall now turn to the process of Sutasoma’s quest of the ultimate truth, his journey to Mount Meru.

---

28 Sutasoma has been often called a *bodhisattwa* by western scholars. For instance, see Pigeaud (1967–70: vol. 1, 188). In the Sutasoma *kakawin* he is twice called “*bodhisattwa*” (1.9 and 140.12).

29 It has been pointed out that there is a similarity between the Buddhist theory of the threefold body and the Hindu notion of divine incarnation. Nagao quotes Coomaraswamy’s statement that “the Dharmakāya is the Brahman, timeless and unconditioned; the Sambhogakāya is realized in the forms of Īśvara; the Nirmāṇakāya in every avatār” (Nagao 1973: 39, note 20).
Sutasoma’s Journey as a Rite of Passage

Sutasoma’s long journey from the palace to Mount Meru and back to the palace, the central series of events in the first half of the story, is where “Platonic time”, one of Bakhtin’s chronotopes, becomes most clearly dominant. The climax in this sequence, in terms of both theme and narrative, occurs on Mount Meru where the hero transfigures himself into Wairocana. It is the moment when Sutasoma realizes his true identity as Wairocana, as well as the moment when he decides to return to the kingdom to become king and protect the world. Without this moment, the other climax of the story, the final confrontation with the man-eater Poruṣāda and the god Kāla, could not happen and, if it had, Sutasoma may not have emerged victorious from the confrontation. The journey thus represents at one level the hero’s successful quest for his true identity and at another a change of social role from Sutasoma the prince to Sutasoma the ascetic and finally to Sutasoma the Buddha-Cakrawartin. In the following sections, we shall investigate how the chronotope is realized in the narrative.

Clark and Holquist, while explicating “adventure time of everyday life”, also one of Bakhtin’s chronotopes, draw attention to a similarity between the three-staged transformation of the character in this chronotope and a process of the “rite of passage”, the concept advanced by anthropologists:

The emphasis on change becomes an emphasis on personal crisis, while the emphasis on continuity now concentrates on the continuity of individual identity. The progression [in Ovid’s Metamorphosis] of Lucias the man to Lucias the ass and finally to Lucias the priest of Isis hints at the cultic origins of the everyday life chronotope. It is clearly a rite of passage, which Bakhtin insists has its origin in the unmediated, oral tradition of folklore. Its pattern resembles that pointed out by anthropologists such as Van Gennep and Victor Turner, who showed the importance of the middle or betwixt-and-between stage called “liminality” which in a rite of passage separates the initial state of identity from the identity achieved at the conclusion of the rite. (1984: 283)
Although the chronotope which is concerned here is "adventure time of everyday life", the concept of "rite of passage" is equally pertinent to "Platonic time" in the story of Sutasoma. It gives a valuable insight into the story structure of Sutasoma’s journey. For instance, as we shall see now, it provides us with plausible answers to questions such as why the elephant-headed monster Gajawaktra needs to be exorcised instead of simply being pacified like the serpent, or why the three creatures who have become Sutasoma’s disciples are not allowed to follow Sutasoma to Mount Meru.

Rite of passage, or rite of transition, is a term to describe the movement of an individual from one social status to another, often marked by ritual. This process is required for the change to be socially accepted and legitimated. The transition itself consists of three stages. The first stage is the rite of separation in which the initiate is separated from society, whereby he loses his initial social status. As a result the initiate is removed from normal existence and "becomes temporarily an abnormal person existing in abnormal time" (Leach 1967: 77). There are a variety of ways to signal the process of separation, among which Leach enumerates four as follows (1967: 77):

(a) the initiate may move in procession from position A to position B
(b) the initiate may take off his (her) original clothing
(c) sacrificial animals may be killed so that life is separated from the carcase or sacrificial objects may be split in half
(d) surface 'dirt' of the initiate may be removed by ritual washing, shaving, etc.

The second stage of the rite of passage is the state of liminality, the very moment of transition, in which a ritual of initiation is conducted. While in this stage, "the initiate is kept physically apart from ordinary people, either by being sent away from the normal home surroundings altogether or by being temporarily housed in an enclosed space from which ordinary people are excluded" (Leach 1976: 77). The initiate is then brought back to the society in the third stage, the rite of aggregation. His new social status is affirmed and he is reintegrated into society. "The actual proceedings in a rite of aggregation are often very similar to those of the initial rite of separation but in
reverse”, meaning that the initiate proceeds in the reverse direction from B to A, he puts on a new costume appropriate to the new social status, food restrictions are removed and hair grown again on his shaven head and so on (Leach 1976: 78).

The Rite of Separation

In the Sutasoma narrative the stage of separation is clearly signalled by the indicators listed above. Firstly, the hero’s separation from ordinary life is indicated by his renunciation of court life and the movement from pura through uninhabited wana to the sacred Mount Meru. We have already seen that the wana functions as a sort of intermediate zone between the profane and the sacred, while the mountain is the symbolic centre of the world, separated from the rest of the world in terms of its altitude, distance and sacredness. Furthermore both wana and mountains are regarded as two suitable places for religious practice in the Sutasoma narrative itself and other Old Javanese texts. In stanza 6.10, to defend his wish to leave the palace, Sutasoma tells his father that he would be pleased to conduct yoga practice only in places such as mountains (giri), cemeteries (kṣetra), sea [shores] (sindu) and forests (wana), all of which should be inaccessible, dangerous and frightening (durga bhayan karēsrēs).30

In the end, however, Mount Meru is chosen by the hero as the destination of his journey, chiefly because the mountain is regarded as the place for the great ascetic Śiwa’s penance.31 But it is also its inaccessibility and the danger involved in the trip to the mountain which ensure the complete separation of the initiate from the other part of the world.

---

30 Stanza 42.4 also states that Gajawaktra, the serpent and the tigress, who have become Sutasoma’s disciples, are allowed to choose a cemetery (kṣetra), sea [shore] (sindu) and a mountain (giri) as the place for asceticism. Mountains (wukir), seashore (sāgaratīra) and cemeteries (kṣetra) are also found among the list of suitable places for religious practice in the Buddhist text Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan (a25).

31 Reference to Mount Meru as the place for Śiwa’s penance is found in stanza 12.3, 16.3 and 28.7. See chapter three for other symbolic aspects of the mountain.
the world that makes Sutasoma, and Siwa before him, decide on the mountain. The difficulty of the journey is summed up by Sutasoma himself when he comes back to the kingdom and tells his father about the journey (91.8): “It was a dangerous and very rough journey and it was not right for one to go up that mountain, for not even a king of the yogis [yogiswara] can come to that difficult spot”.

The second indication of separation is the hero’s change of appearance in accordance with certain prescriptions. In stanza 6.4, Mahosadhi, the purohita (chief court-brahman) of Hastina kingdom describes the appearance of the three types of people who are considered to be sages (pandita): those who wear bark clothing (mawalkala), those who are shaven-headed (mundirupa), and those who wear a head-gear (malingga-mürdha). Although the narrative does not recount when and how Sutasoma undergoes the change of appearance, stanza 24.3, in which Sutasoma tells the Buddhist sage Sumitra that he would be happy to become an shaven-headed anchorite in the forest (wanagamana mundli), and stanza 54.8, which states that when after the meditation Sutasonia decides to return to the kingdom “at once his hair grows long again, and there is no sign that it has been cut”, indicate that the hero has become shaven-headed in the stage of separation. This is in accordance with a description in the Old Javanese Buddhist text Jinarthiprakriti (1.1), which prescribes that a Buddhist monk have a shaven head (mūrdli), a bracelet (gōluwa), a rosary (gaṇitri), a sash (paragi), a set of robes (sāmbara), a belt (katiwandha) and a meditation cloth (yogapata).32

In the narrative the third and fourth indications of separation, sacrifice and purification, are dramatized in Sutasoma’s encounter with three creatures, the elephant-headed monster Gajawaktra, the serpent and the tigress, events dramatic enough to call for a detailed analysis on their own. Before we look into these events, however, we

32 The Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan also gives the prescription of a Buddhist monk’s appearance (b25–a26), but interestingly it does not mention “shaven-head”. For the further discussion on the monk’s appearance, see Schoterman and Teeuw (1985: 204–5, 228–9).
shall pay attention to one miraculous event which precedes these events. It is another indication of separation, though it is not included in Leach’s enumeration, that is, the “guardian of the threshold” (Van Gennep 1960: 21). This is a holy figure who stands at the threshold of the state of liminality, only successful negotiation with whom enables the initiate to proceed further.

In the Sutasoma narrative we see the guardian of the threshold in the goddess Widyutkarâli, who appears before the hero when he meditates in a cemetery which he reaches after leaving the palace (9.5–12.4). A cemetery (kṣetra) is one of the places which are recommended for meditation, because it is inaccessible, dangerous and frightening. The narrative in fact describes the frightening scene of the cemetery where corpses, both new and old, are scattered and decomposed, and dogs are fighting for flesh from the corpses. After sunset Sutasoma enters a place of worship (pangarcanan) in the cemetery to worship the goddess Bherawi.33 Having made a gesture of homage, his mind is fixed on the void (Śūnya). When he is absorbed in meditation, the excellent bodhisattwa is embodied in himself. Then a beam of light appears from the top of his head, circling his head three times, and disappears into his face. When he achieves complete void in his mind, sweat (sweda) drops from his face to the ground, causing a terrible earthquake. It is at this moment that the goddess Widyutkarâli appears before him. She is described as a goddess of horrible aspect, who is black, twelve-headed, with glittering red eyes, sharp canine teeth and red hair, holding various weapons in her ten hands.34

33 The goddess Bherawi, or Bhairawi, is a form of the goddess Durgâ, the fierce aspect of the wife of Śiva (Kinsley 1986: 163). It is interesting to note that in the present Balinese tradition the goddess who appears before Sutasoma and instructs him is said to be Durgâ (Hobart 1990: 82).

34 As O’Brien points out, a close correspondence between the goddess Widyutkarâli and the goddess Vidyujjvalâkarâli, one of the aspects of the Tantric Buddhist goddess Ekajaṭâ, is unquestionable (1988–89: 161). According to Bhattacharyya (1980: 134–5), the goddess Ekajaṭâ is described as having “a blue form” and being “terrible in appearance and awe-inspiring, with hair rising upwards in
After proclaiming that Sutasoma will achieve the great supernatural power of yoga (mahāyogasiddhi), the goddess praises him because he has destroyed the six enemies (śacwargasaśatru) and the three obstacles (triwighna) by his four pious actions (brahmāwihāra). She then proclaims that Sutasoma be called Swedambuja (sweat-born) and bestows on him the mantra named mahāḥṛdayadharāṇī. Finally, before disappearing, she instructs him to go to Mount Meru to meditate because it was the hermitage of the god Śiva (bhaṭāra Guru), who became the perfect king of yogi (yogīswara). In this encounter with the goddess the hero is equipped with a new name, although it is never mentioned again, magical force and instruction. Thus the process of separation is completed, except for the stages of sacrifice and purification, to which we shall now turn.

Encounter with the Three Creatures: Sacrifice and Purification

According to Hubert and Mauss, sacrifice has three aspects (1964: 9–13). First of all, sacrifice implies a consecration, in which an object of sacrifice passes from the profane into the sacred domain. Secondly, the object of sacrifice has to be destroyed. In other words, the object becomes a victim. Even when the object has already been the shape of a flame of fire, canine teeth, garments of tiger’s skin, three bloodshot eyes and protruding tongue”. She is called Vidyujjvalākarāli in her twelve-faced and twenty-four-armed form. Although the number of the arms is different, most of the attributes she holds in her hands are similar to her Javanese counterpart, among which are a bow, a noose, a sword, a mace, a bajra, a cakra, and a skull-cup (kapāla). She is also said to originate, like Widyutkarāli, from the sweat of the Buddha (Bhattacharyya 1968: 194). Moreover, the goddess Ekajatā is said to possess a powerful mantra which enables a person who listens to it to get rid of all obstacles, obtain good fortune, destroy his enemies and attain Buddha-hood (Bhattacharyya 1968: 193). The presence of this goddess in the Sutasoma kakawin is one of the most unambiguous evidence that the kakawin has a strong connection with the Anuttarayoga Tantra.

35 In Tantric Buddhism “ḥṛdaya” and “dhāraṇī” are used as synonyms of “mantra”, that is, “an enunciation of certain syllables, which should have a spontaneous effect, when correctly pronounced by someone who is initiated into its use” (Snellgrove 1987: 141–3)
sanctified, its spirit is still caught in its body and hence attached to the profane world. “Death will release it, thereby making the consecration definitive and irrevocable.” Finally, the effect of the consecration extends beyond the object which is consecrated. “The devotee who provides the victim which is the object of the consecration is not, at the completion of the operation, the same as he was at the beginning. He has acquired a religious character which he did not have before, or has rid himself of an unfavourable character with which he was affected”.

While the first two aspects make the ritual of sacrifice distinct from other rituals such as offering, it is the third one that makes sacrifice an integral part of the proceedings of the rite of passage, in particular the rite of separation. This extension of the effect of the consecration is made possible by the logic that, in the context of the rite of separation, the victim of the sacrifice is identified as the initiate himself who is a participant in the sacrifice as the donor of the victim. In other words, the victim of the sacrifice is actually the substitution of the initiate himself. Leach asserts that:

The paradigmatic idea is that the procedures of the rite separate the ‘initiate’ into two parts—one pure, the other impure. The impure part can then be left behind, while the pure part can be aggregated to the initiate’s new status. In the case of sacrifice the sacrificial victim plays the part of the initiate, but since the victim has first been identified with the donor of the sacrifice, the donor is, by vicarious association, likewise purified and initiated into a new ritual status. (1976: 84)

Thus, through the sacrificial proceedings which are “markers of boundaries in social time” (Leach 1976: 84), the rite of separation effectively purifies the initiate and completes his separation from the profane state.

Sutasoma’s involvement in sacrificial proceedings occurs after he resumes the journey through the wana to Mount Meru, accompanied by a group of sages lead by Keśawa and Sumitra. After short sojourns at their hermitages at the foot of the mountain, where the hero arrives after a seven-day journey, his encounter with Gajawaktra, the serpent and the tigress represents the sacrificial proceedings.
The first creature encountered is a ferocious elephant-headed demon Gajawaktra, who inhabits the terrifying ravines which Sutasoma and his companions are approaching. The sage Keśawa warns Sutasoma of the danger and tells him about the demon. He is the son of Śuciloma, but in truth is the incarnation of the kali age. This is a very interesting statement because at the Buddhist hermitage Sutasoma was already told by the sage Sumitra that the demon Poruṣāda was the former incarnation Śuciloma and that Śuciloma himself was the incarnation of the kali age. Thus Gajawaktra is in a sense the son of Poruṣāda. Then, like his “father”, Gajawaktra’s “savageness is that of the god Kālarudra looking upon the world at the time of destruction” (29.9).36 He was made invincible by the god Śiwa as a gift in the hermitage on Mount Himālaya. Like Gaṇeša, the son of Śiwa, he has an elephant’s head, hence his name “elephant headed”, and becomes four-armed in battle, although, unlike the benevolent Gaṇeša, he is savage and terrorizes all the creatures in the area where he lives.

Despite the sage’s warning, Sutasoma, out of concern for the world, decides to see the demon in the hope of stopping his evil deeds. Sutasoma, when challenged by the demon, points out that it is the demon himself who is in peril. He explains that those who commit the sin of taking other lives, are not only distancing themselves from the state of void (śūnyapada) but also leading themselves to hell (gomukha), where they will be tormented by the army of the god of death, Yama, for a thousand years. Because their passion (rajah) and mental darkness (tamah) do not decrease, while their virtue (sattwa) is reduced,37 the six enemies (ṣaḍripuśatru) and the three

---

36 In the Arjunawijaya (6.1) the demon Rawana is also compared to the god Kālarudra, because of his unlimited but also uncontrollable power which threatens to destroy the whole world.

37 Rajah, tamah and sattwa, called triguna as a set, are the three constituents of nature.
obstacles (triwighna) will taint their heart.\(^3\)\(^8\) These impurities will bury their body “under an avalanche of mountains, and because great sattwa is absent, it will be shattered” (30.16). Sutasoma then makes a comparison between the savage Gajawaktra who abuses his power to frighten the world and Gaṇa, the benevolent elephant-headed son of Śiwa (Smaradagdhaṇa), who kills a demon king to protect the world.\(^3\)\(^9\) He warns Gajawaktra that if he does not stop his evil deeds he will be killed at the hands of the king Daśabahu.

\(^3\)\(^8\) The idea that the contamination of one’s body by the six enemies leads the one to the hell is one of Wairocana’s teachings in the Kuṭṭākaraṇa (20.4–5).

\(^3\)\(^9\) The late twelfth century kakawin Smaradahana tells of the birth of Gaṇa, more commonly known as Gaṇeśa. When the powerful demon king Nilarudraka—even Viṣṇu and Brahmā are powerless before him—threatens the heavens, the gods are informed that only Śiwa’s unborn son can kill the demon. To interrupt Śiwa, who is performing severe penance on Mount Meru to such an extent that he is indifferent even to his spouse Umā, the love god Kāma is sent by the gods to inflame Śiwa’s desire for Umā. Although Kāma succeeds in diverting Śiwa’s attention to the charm of Umā, Śiwa, enraged by the disturbance, burns the love god to ashes. From the union of Śiwa and Umā, the elephant-headed son Gaṇa is born, who later kills the demon, gaining the title “Gaṇāṇjaya” (Gaṇa the Victorious) (Zoetmulder 1974: 291–5). It is then apparent that the mention of Gaṇāṇjaya (29.10) and Śiwa as Smaradagdha (the one who burns the love god) (31.2) in the Sutasoma kakawin are allusions to the kakawin Smaradahana. What is not immediately apparent, however, from the description of the Sutasoma kakawin is whether the demon Gajawaktra in the Sutasoma and the elephant-headed son of Śiwa, Gaṇeśa, in the Smaradahana are related. Nevertheless, the statement in stanza 41.4 that Gaṇeśa is a fruit of parents’ passion (rāga), and thus prone to the influence of mental impurities, seems to indicate that here the author Tantular is suggesting that Gajawaktra is in fact the degraded form of Gaṇeśa himself, a fruit of Śiwa and Umā’s passion. Moreover, the ferocious aspect of Gaṇeśa and his association with the god Kāla were well established in ancient Java as we can see in the image of Gaṇeśa from Caṇḍi Bara. According to Daweeuwarn, “the use of skull ornaments in the representations of Gaṇeśa images is a purely Javanese conception. This happened because of Gaṇeśa’s association with Śiva who, in the form of Bhairava, wears a garland of skulls (kapāla-mālā). This is best illustrated by the Gaṇeśa image of Bara. According to the chronogram in words on its pedestal it is dated 1239 A.D.—in the early Singhasari period. The god carries his usual attributes but a number of skulls are seen on the pedestal. Gaṇeśa is the god who removes all dangers and difficulties. In this case he is himself protected by a large
Enraged by Sutasoma’s words, Gajawaktra assumes the *triwikrama* form and threatens to destroy the world, when the gods headed by Indra appear and ask Sutasoma to save the world. As he begins his meditation with his hands in the *bodhyagrimudrā*, a *bhidura* weapon emerges from his mind. This is hurled at the breast of Gajawaktra, which overwhems him with indescribable pain. The god Gaṇa (Gañeśa), regaining serenity, departs the body of the demon and returns to heaven with the gods. The demon, left on the ground, then asks for mercy and becomes a Buddhist monk, by taking the Mahāyāna vows (*mahāyānabrata*) and being initiated by Sutasoma.

On the surface this episode of the encounter with Gajawaktra is the event in which the hero demonstrates that he has already reached a spiritual level high enough to exert a strong enough spiritual force to exorcise the demon. In the context of the rite of separation, however, it can be also seen that when Sutasoma exorcises the elephant-headed demon, he is actually purifying himself. The demon who is blinded by *rajah* and *tamah* is a metaphor of the initiate’s own impurities which he has to get rid of to

---

Kāla head against dangerous influences threatening him from the rear. . . . Very similar arrangement of skulls is also seen in the statue from Chandi Singhasari” (1982: 196). Another example of the fierce aspect of Gañeśa is found in Tantular’s *kakawin* Arjunawijaya (2.8): “[In the garden of the Rāwaṇa’s palace, Lėngkā,] the water sprang from the mouth of a statue of Gajendra[mukha] [the elephant-headed, that is, Gañeṣa] in furious anger, / which was placed under the heavenly coral tree; whirling his trunk, / he looked awesome and terrible, like the god Gaṇa bent on destroying the world.” It appears, then, that Tantular implies that the power granted by Śiva inevitably makes the mind of its owner vulnerable to mental degradation, causing him to abuse power. We shall discuss this matter further below.

40 _Bodhyagrimudrā_ is the hand gesture (*mudrā*) of the highest wisdom, customarily associated with the Buddha Wairocana. Apart from the Sutasoma *kakawin*, Wairocana is described as holding this *mudrā* in the Kuñjaraṭṭa (17.1) and the Arjunawijaya (26.4). The *mudrā* and its association with Wairocana must have been well established in ancient Javanese society since the ninth century, for many small Wairocana statues with the *mudrā*, considered to originate from the late ninth to the first half of the tenth centuries, have been found (Lunsingh Scheurleer and Klokke 1988: plates 39, 41 and 47).
achieve his transition from profane to sacred. Of course, Sutasoma is supposed to be immaculate as Buddha’s incarnation, but here he is given an exemplary role on behalf of other aspirant initiates. The soul of the god Gāna, which has been trapped in the demon’s body, is now liberated and returns to the divine domain, whereas the demon, who is left on the ground, turns away from his ferocious life and becomes a Buddhist monk. Their consecration is accomplished. However, unlike in the normal course of a rite of sacrifice, the destruction of the body of the victim (the demon in this case) is not only undesirable because it is against the Buddhist creed, but also unnecessary because the ultimate aim of the destruction, the irreversible completion of the purification and liberation of the essence of the victim, has been already achieved. By the symbolism of sacrifice, the mind of the initiate, Sutasoma, is now completely purged of impurity. The whole process clearly corresponds to that of sacrificial ritual.

In addition, from the narratological point of view, this episode also serves to anticipate the climax of the story, the episode in which Sutasoma encounters the demon king Porušāda. The effect of anticipation is that it causes the audience to expect what is to come and gives the audience clues about how to understand its significance when it comes. Bal gives an interesting account of what she calls “mirror-text”, a subtext embedded in the main text, one which reduplicates, reflects or mirrors one or more aspects of the main text (1985: 146). She then asserts that:

The place of the embedded text—the mirror-text—in the primary text determines its function for the reader. When the mirror-text occurs near the beginning the reader may, on the basis of the mirror-text, predict the end of the primary fabula [that is, story in our term]. In order to maintain suspense, the resemblance is often veiled. The embedded text will only be interpreted as mirror-text, and ‘give away’ the outcome, when the reader is able to capture the partial resemblance through abstraction. That abstract resemblance, however, is usually only captured after the end, when we know the outcome. Thus suspense is maintained, but the prefiguring effect of the mirror-text is lost. (1985: 146)
In the narrative the episode of the encounter with Gajawaktra functions as a “mirror-text” of the whole story, in which the episode of the encounter with Poruṣāda is the climax. Thus the first episode anticipates the outcome of the second and in doing so makes the audience better prepared for it. There are several common elements in the two episodes which the audience can see as evidence of “mirror-text”. Both antagonists in the two episodes are demonic and beastly. In the first place, Gajawaktra naturally inherits demonic traits from his “father” Poruṣāda. Secondly, Gajawaktra is the incarnation of kali and has an elephant’s head, whereas Poruṣāda is the reincarnation of the demon Suciloma, who is in turn the incarnation of kali. Furthermore, in the Pālī Mahāsutasomajātaka, to which the Sutasoma kakawin is closely related, Poruṣāda is also a child born of a union between a king and a lioness, thus inheriting a bestial nature. Both Gajawaktra and Poruṣāda are favoured by Śiwa and as a result are granted the gift of supernatural power by the god. While initially they may be benevolent, arrogance eventually takes control of their natures and they begin to abuse their power and terrorise the world, revealing the destructive force of Śiwa.

However, the most striking parallel between the two episodes is found in the account of Sutasoma’s encounter with Poruṣāda itself, which has a nearly identical pattern to that of the encounter with Gajawaktra (138.1–139.20). When Sutasoma finally comes forward to see the demon king Poruṣāda, who is now manifestly possessed by Rudra, the fierce and destructive aspect of Śiwa, the demon becomes more furious, because his attack of fire does not harm Sutasoma at all. He transforms himself into Kālāgnirudra, Rudra in the form of the world-destroying fire, and threatens to consume the whole world. A flock of gods, including Brahmā, Wiṣṇu, Gaṇa and Indra, hurriedly descend to dissuade Poruṣāda–Rudra from destroying the world, informing him that Śiwa’s truth and Buddha’s truth are the same. They ask Sutasoma to save the world from destruction. Sutasoma begins to meditate with his hands in bodhyagrimudrā, from which a sharp bajra appears and pacifies Poruṣāda–
Rudra. The god Rudra becomes peaceful and, recalling that Sutasoma is none other than the incarnation of Buddha, leaves Poruṣāda’s body to return to the heaven with other gods. Poruṣāda, left powerless on the ground, submits to Sutasoma, as benevolence (metriyā), compassion (karunya), joy (muditā) and equanimity (upekṣa), that is, the four pious actions (brahmāwihāra), grow in his mind (139.18). It is clear thus that the “mirror-text” shares with the main story the same elements: the neutralization of the demon’s attack on the hero, the enraged demon’s threat to destroy the whole world, the descent of gods who are fearful of the destruction of the world, the hero’s use of the bodhyagrimudrā to pacify the demon, and the liberation of a divine spirit from the demon’s body.41 The second episode, however, is not merely a recapitulation of the first. The dramatic intensity is much greater in the second, for it is the god Śiwa himself who is to be released from the demon’s body.

Gajawaktra, who has just become a disciple of Sutasoma, soon learns how to put Sutasoma’s teachings into practice, when a gigantic serpent (nāga) attacks the prince. Gajawaktra intercepts the attack and attempts to burn the serpent by bāywagnyardhana (the concentration of the mind to produce a fiery wind), just as he used to do when he encountered an enemy. But he is ordered by Sutasoma not to kill the serpent, because to kill even an enemy is against the teaching of Buddhism. Accordingly Gajawaktra applies mental power, as Sutasoma had done to him, and pacifies the serpent, who then becomes Sutasoma’s second disciple. Unlike the first encounter, the second encounter with the serpent is not really meant for Sutasoma, for

41 It is notable that both Gajawaktra and Poruṣāda are pacified through exorcism. Exorcism in fact works in two ways. It frees the possessed from the possessing deity, but at the same time it liberates the deity from confinement in a condition of impure material existence. Although the theme of exorcism is found in both kakawin and kidung literature, it is usually treated as a minor episode in the former, for instance in the Rāmāyaṇa (Zoetmulder 1974: 220). By contrast it is one of the major themes of stories in kidung literature, such as the Sudamala and the Calon Arang (Zoetmulder 1974: 433–4, 436). This appears to be another indication of the transitionary character of the Sutasoma kakawin.
it is actually the converted Gajawaktra who has to try his newly mastered mental power. It can be thus said that the function of this episode is to confirm the efficacy of the mental power imparted by Sutasoma to the Gajawaktra.

The most demanding test for Sutasoma comes in the third encounter with the tigress, who, pressed by starvation, is about to eat her own cub. Sutasoma appeals to her not to commit this heinous crime, but the tigress, though realizing how atrocious her conduct is, replies there is nothing else to eat in the forest except for the cub. Out of great compassion (karunā), Sutasoma offers his own body as food. Accepting the offer, the tigress tears his breast and sucks up his blood, killing Sutasoma. Freed from the bondage of body, Sutasoma’s soul returns to the abode of Buddha (Buddhaloka), to the great grief of Gajawaktra, the serpent and the sages. However, affected by the miraculous effect of the Sutasoma’s blood, which had become amrta, the tigress repents of her deed and wishes to follow Sutasoma in death. At this point the god Surendra (Indra) descends and revives Sutasoma. While the tigress pays homage to Sutasoma, and Gajawaktra, the serpent and the sages rejoice, Sutasoma is saddened because his ultimate objective kamokṣan (the liberation from the world of suffering) has been interrupted. But Indra explains to him that if he had not been revived the tigress would have killed herself and thus his compassion (karunā) toward the tigress would have been pointless. Furthermore it was in the interest of the welfare of the world (jagaddhita) that Sutasoma’s life should be preserved.

Although not as clear as in the case of the episode of Gajawaktra, the episode of the tigress may be another mirror-text, for there are some common elements in Sutasoma’s encounter with the tigress and his encounter with the god Kāla. While the tigress is affected by Sutasoma’s blood which she sucks and which turns to amrta, Kāla is also affected by amrta when he swallows Sutasoma into his stomach.

---

42 Although Soewito-Santoso’s translation maintains that the animal is a lioness, there is no doubt that it is a tigress, for in stanza 36.3 the god Surendra (Indra) addresses the animal as “mong bibi” (tiger lady).
Moreover, in both episodes the pacification of evil leads to Sutasoma’s didactic discourse to newly converted disciples, who then retreat to separate hermitages to continue Buddhist practice. The mirror-text, used in this way, is not a redundant episode but can be a powerful narrative device employed by the author to emphasize his point. We shall return to the religious significance of these mirror-texts and the contents of the didactic discourses at the end of this chapter.

Moreover, the episode of a bodhisattwa sacrificing his own body to save a starving beast is also a popular one in the Buddhist jātaka literature. Its theme is also well known in both Indian and Javanese Buddhist literature illustrating the virtue of utterly selfless generosity towards other beings (dāna), the first of bodhisattwa’s six perfections (pāramitā). It is beyond doubt that when composing this episode the author of the kakawin must have drawn on the jātaka literature, even though we do not know which text he used. However, while in the jātaka literature self-sacrifice itself is considered to be the bodhisattwa’s goal, hence constituting the climatic finale of the story, in the Sutasoma narrative the story does not end in the hero’s sacrifice, because he is resurrected against his will by the divine intervention. At the plot level, this deviation from the jātaka literature may be explained, although somewhat teleologically, by the presumption that the hero has to be kept alive for the sake of the

43 The best example is the Vyāghrijātaka, the first episode of the Sanskrit Jātakamālā. The episode is reproduced in the reliefs of Candi Borobudur (Krom 1927). For further information, see Feer (1889). Ensink points out that the theme of “a sacrifice to a tiger as a visualization of the Buddhist way” is also found in the popular Middle Javanese tale Bubhuksa, in which the ascetic Bubhuksa offers himself to a tiger, which is in fact sent by the god Guru to test him, when the tiger demands human flesh (1974: 201–2).

44 The Jinārthiprakṛti states that: “One should give away one’s wife, even one’s son or daughter, if somebody wants them. One’s own blood, flesh, one’s liver, even one’s own eyes are to be given away if somebody wants them. Such is the Perfection of Charity [dānapāramitā]” (1.14). The Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan considers the act of giving away one’s own body as the greatest charity (mahātīdāna) of the three kinds of charity (a29).
development of the plot which requires him to become Wairocana and save the world from destruction by the antagonist. A plot is, as Culler puts it, “subject to teleological determination: certain things happen in order that the récit [discourse] may develop as it does” (1975: 209). This logic is seen in Indra’s speech when he argues in effect that Sutasoma’s demonstration of compassion in point of fact contradicts his desire for self-redemption, hence paving the way for his return to the kingdom for the benefit of the world. In the context of the rite of passage, on the other hand, Sutasoma’s act of giving up his own body to the tigress can be clearly seen as the act of sacrifice. As we have seen, in the rite of separation, Sutasoma, the initiate himself, is identified as the victim of the sacrifice. Therefore his body must be destroyed and his soul must be liberated, in order to be born again as a new self. Thus, while in the jātaka literature the bodhisattwa’s self-sacrifice is the demonstration of selfless generosity, in the rite of passage the hero’s self-sacrifice and resurrection is the symbolism of transition. Leach has observed in this regard that “since every discontinuity in social time is the end of one period and the beginning of another, and since birth/death is a self-evident ‘natural’ representation of beginning/end, death and rebirth symbolism is appropriate to all rites of transition and is palpably manifest in a wide variety of cases” (1976: 78–9).

The rite of separation is completed when, after giving teachings to Gajawaktra, the serpent and the tigress, Sutasoma leaves them at their hermitages in order to go on alone to the summit of Mount Meru where he engages in meditation. The notion of separation is reiterated in Sutasoma’s separation from the three disciples. If Sutasoma is to be initiated, they have to be left behind at this stage, for they are the metaphor of the impurity of the initiate himself. Now Sutasoma is completely purified and ready to enter the next stage, the state of liminality.

The State of Liminality and the Rite of Aggregation

The state of liminality is the very moment of transition and coincides with a climax in the narrative. Sutasoma, engaged in meditation on the summit of Mount
Meru, has successfully resisted the temptation by celestial nymphs and Indra, when he transfigures himself into Wairocana. Then the Buddhas, the gods, demigods and sages appear before him and praise him as Wairocana and plead with him to bring to fulfillment the real reason he has been incarnated as Sutasoma, the pacification of Poruṣāda. Although Sutasoma is the incarnation of Wairocana, his real identity has not been fully realized by himself until this moment. Thus, the transition of Sutasoma's identity is not so much the assumption of a new identity as the realization of his true self. Separation, an important aspect of the state of liminality, is symbolized by the geographical and symbolic distance between Mount Meru and society, and by the hero's absorption in meditation, in which he mentally shuts himself off from any sensory impression and demonstrates in particular unshakable indifference to sexual allurement.

Having accepted the gods' request, Sutasoma returns to his princely form and decides to return to the society. This is the third stage, the rite of aggregation, in which the initiate is re-incorporated into the society. The process of aggregation is the reversal of that of separation. His hair grows again instantaneously (54.8). He returns from Mount Meru to society. While he had to walked to the mountain in the process of separation, now, having gained supernatural faculties, he can fly through huge mountain ranges from the top of the mountain to the ground level (54.12–14). His reintegration into the society is completed when he marries his cousin Candrawati, sister of the king of Kāśi, Daśabāhu, and then succeeds to the throne of the kingdom of Hastina. Thus the reintegration is in fact the fusion of the status of the Buddha and the status of king, the royal householder who maintains the domestic life and the social order. While the historical Buddha had to give up the possibility of becoming the Cakravartin in order to become the Buddha, Sutasoma is able to become Buddha and Cakravartin at the same time. The religious grounds that enables this fusion is Tantric Buddhism. In the narrative the main events in the state of liminality and the rite of aggregation are explicitly marked by the Tantric Buddhist device of the maṇḍala, a
symbolic spatial configuration. In the light of mandala we shall examine the state of liminality and the rite of aggregation in the next section.

**Double Mandala in the Sutasoma Narrative**

*Mandala* in Tantric Buddhism

A *mandala* is a schematized diagram originally developed in Tantric Buddhism as a sort of visual aid to help a yogin, a meditating practitioner, achieve the identification of himself with the supreme deity. The idea is based on the fundamental tenet of Tantric Buddhism, adwaya, non-duality of the absolute truth and the phenomenal world. A *mandala* is conceived by the yogin as “a geometric projection of the world reduced to an essential pattern” in which the non-dual state of microcosmos and macrocosmos is achieved (Tucci 1961: 25). In Tantric Buddhism, which pursues an instant attainment of Buddhahood through ritualized meditation, no other procedure is more important than that of initiation. The yogin who is guided by his guru crosses the boarder between the state of the profane and that of the sacred. A *mandala* is commonly involved in this process as an visual aid. Although in our analysis of the Sutasoma narrative the term initiation is used for understanding the narrative in a wider sense than it is used in Tantric ritual, the application of *mandala* structure to the vital moment of the story is significant. Sutasoma is not an ordinary yogin, but the

---

45 The idea that more than one *mandala* may be embedded in the Sutasoma narrative first surfaced in the reading sessions with K. P. O’Brien under the supervision of Peter Worsely. O’Brien subsequently advanced the idea in O’Brien (1988–89). Although I am in complete agreement with O’Brien in regard to the presence of the *mandala*, I disagree with her on what episodes exactly constitute, in particular, the *mandala* on Mount Meru. She asserts that the episode of Sutasoma’s encounter with the three creatures on the way to Mount Meru is part of the *mandala* configuration, whereas, although I share her opinion that the episode is not a mere didactic digression, I prefer to consider the episode to be situated outside the *mandala*. Notwithstanding this difference, I believe our discussions on the issue complement each other, for, while my approach is to relate the *mandala* to the narrative aspect of the text, O’Brien has taken an iconographic approach.
Supreme Buddha Wairocana himself. This is a precondition which the reader has to accept as part of the narrative process, for to carry on reading or listening to a narrative the reader has to accept, at least temporally, the authority of narrative. Sutasoma also does not require a guru nor anything else which might be essential for an ordinary yogin. The initiation set in the narrative is not the ritual of initiation per se, but the chronotopical transformation of the status of the hero. The use of manḍala signifies this transformation.

Although a manḍala can be represented in various styles depending on historical period and sectarian difference, a description of a manḍala of the manifestation of the five Buddhas will illustrate a typical structure of a manḍala.\(^{46}\) Firstly, the manḍala is separated from the outer world by three concentric circles. The outermost circle is the Mountain of Fire, which symbolically represents “consciousness that must burn ignorance, dispelling the darkness of error” (Tucci 1961: 39). After this circle a girdle of bajra (vajra in Sanskrit). Bajra, customarily rendered as “diamond”, symbolizes “Supreme Cognition, bodhi, Illumination, Absolute Essence, Cosmic Consciousness, which, once it has been attained is never again lost” (Tucci 1961: 39). Then comes a girdle of lotus petals, which signify “spiritual rebirth” (Tucci 1961: 42).\(^{47}\) In the middle of these circles is situated the

\(^{46}\) The manḍala used here as an example is called “Thung-pa Dam-Tshigs gSum-bKod-IHoa-Ngahi dKyi1-hKhor” and is illustrated in Olschak (1987: 35). This is the second of the hundred and thirty-two “Diamond Rosary Mandalas”, commissioned by Künga Zangpo at the beginning of the fifteenth century. This manḍala belongs to the Kriyā Tantra class and has “a general pattern analogous to all meditation Mandalas” (Olschak 1987: 36).

\(^{47}\) It must be noted here that the entrance into the manḍala through the outer circles is analogous to the rite of separation in the rite of passage, for during the entrance the initiate moves from the outside to the inside of the manḍala, rids his mind of impurity and experiences spiritual rebirth. On this ground it may be possible to argue that the episode of Sutasoma’s encounter with the three creatures is in fact the representation of the three outer circles of the manḍala, although not the central part of the manḍala as O’Brien asserts (1988–89).
square-shaped part called "palace" (wimāna). This is the main part of the maṇḍala where the central and subordinate deities reside. The palace is surrounded by the walls which are usually made up of five layers. In the centre of each of the four wall sides a gate opens into the inside. The gates face towards the four cardinal points. Over each gate stands a toraṇa, a kind of triumphal arch. On the top of this arch is the Wheel of Law, crowned by an umbrella, a symbol of royalty, and flanked by two gazelles, signifying the Buddha's sermon in the deer park at Sarnath. Each arch is also flanked by two marine monsters (makara) from whose mouths ornaments issue. Between the outer circles and the walls are seen many celestial beings and objects including umbrellas, banners and the seven gems (saptaratna) of the Cakrawartin. Inside the palace reside the deities who are either seated or standing usually on a lotus seat. In the case of this particular maṇḍala all five Buddhas are seated on lotus seats. The central deity Buddha Śākyamuni is seated in the centre of the palace, while the other four Buddhas, his four manifestations, are seated surrounding him.

This brief description of a maṇḍala makes it clear that "the correspondence between the ground-plan of the royal city and the basic pattern of a maṇḍala, together with the emblems which decorate it, leave no doubt that the maṇḍala was thought of as a palace" (Tucci 1961: 44). This correspondence is also closely related to the notion of Buddhahood as analogous to kingship. The Buddhist initiation ceremony which is performed in a maṇḍala is called abhiśeka, "coronation", for it requires an aspersion with water, as does its royal counterpart. And the Buddha images depicted in a

48 The designation of deities depend on individual Tantras which the maṇḍala is based on. In this particular maṇḍala the central deity is Buddha Śākyamuni, who is surrounded by his four manifestations. There are certain tendencies as to which deities are chosen according to the Tantra class, which are discussed below.

49 The intrinsic connection between the Buddhist abhiśeka and its royal counterpart was also known in the ancient Javanese society, for in the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānan Mantranaya the ritual is called the abhiśeka of the Cakrawartin (Kats 1901).
*mandala* often wear a mantle and a crown (Tucci 1961: 44). Moreover, as we have seen, according to the life story of the Buddha, when he was born he was said to have the potential to become the Cakrawartin as well as to become the Buddha, because of his physical marks.

In a narrative a *mandala* may not be represented in the same way as it is represented graphically, but its main features are retained. Pott proposes a definition of a *mandala* broad enough to include *mandala* in different forms of representation (1966: 71). According to his formulation a *mandala* is:

> a cosmic configuration in the centre of which is an image or symbolic substitute of a prominent god surrounded by those of a number of deities of lower rank ordered hierarchically both among themselves and in relation to the chief figure, which configuration may be used as an aid to meditation and in ritual as receptacle for the gods, being distinguished from a yantra by a more graphic representation of the deities or their symbols and by a richer elaboration of the details.

From this definition, we can extract several distinctive features of the *mandala* configuration. Firstly, a *mandala* has a centre. The central deity is situated in the centre of the *mandala*. The centre is at the same time the centre of the cosmos. Then other deities are arranged around the four cardinal points and other intermediate points which radiate from the centre of the diagram. Secondly, then, a *mandala* is hierarchical. While the main deity is situated in the central section of the palace, the other subordinate deities and other beings are situated towards the periphery. The closer to the centre the position of a deity in the diagram is the the more sacred it is. Thirdly, a *mandala* is the location of the hierophany of the supreme deity. In the centre the supreme deity reveals itself, and is then, through Tantric ritual, identified with the yogin himself. Lastly, although this is not explicit in Pott’s definition, a *mandala* has a boundary by which inside and outside is clearly distinguished. The inside is consecrated as a most sacred space, whereas the outside is profane.
While the basic structure of a *mandala* may be retained through history and across sectarian differences within Tantric Buddhism, the designation of deities in the *mandala* varies significantly. The designation is defined by the Tantra on which the *mandala* is based. The Buddhist Tantras are customarily classified into four classes (Snellgrove 1987: 119). This fourfold classification was devised by the renowned Tibetan scholar Bu-sTon in the fourteenth century, when the most of major Tantric texts had been already written. The texts are classified according to their perceived theoretical advancement rather than their chronological order. The earlier, or less advanced texts, including even the texts which do not bear the title *tantra* but *sūtra*, are not discarded but incorporated into a lesser class of the classification. The four classes in the ascending order of advancement are:

1) Kriyā Tantra (Action Tantra)
2) Carya Tantra (Performance Tantra)
3) Yoga Tantra (Yoga Tantra)
4) Anuttarayoga Tantra (Supreme Yoga Tantra)

To the Kriyā Tantra belong early Tantra texts such as the *Suvānaprabhāsottama-sūtra* (fourth century), the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (late seventh century to mid-eighth century) and the *Amoghapāsakalparāja* (early eighth century). The first text is in particular remarkable, because it is in this text for the first time that a set of the four Buddhas, predecessor of the five Buddhas, also known as the five Jina Buddhas, appear. They are Aksobhya, Ratnaketu or Ratnaketunā, Amitāyus or Amitābha, and Dundubhiśvara, allocated to east, south, west and north respectively (Matsunaga 1969: 42). The five Jina Buddhas began to appear around the beginning of the eighth century as the *Amoghapāsakalparāja* testifies, although the names were not yet

---


51 The five Buddhas are sometimes erroneously called the Dhyāni Buddhas, which are not attested by Buddhist literature (Snodgrass 1985: 135).
standardized. Basically the five Buddhas are the four above mentioned Buddhas and either Śākyamuni or Wairocana. The formation of a manḍala was still under way, for in the Kriyā Tantra, at an early stage of Tantric Buddhism, theory was unsystematic and fragmentary. Most of the texts of this class are concerned with magical formulas to ward off various misfortunes or to gain good fortune. The Buddha Śākyamuni is as a rule the one who imparts the magic formulas to disciples in the narrated stories in the texts (Matsunaga 1969: 54).

However, in the second and third classes, the Carya and Yoga Tantras, the Buddha who teaches is Wairocana. The attainment of Buddhahood becomes the ultimate objective of the Tantras. More effort is put into formulating a cohesive exposition of Mahāyāna theories and esoteric rituals. The Carya Tantra is represented by the Mahāvairocanasūtra,52 which describes a manḍala unique to this Tantra called the garbhakośa-manḍala (Matrix Mandala).53 The core part of the manḍala consists of the main deity Mahāvairocana in the centre and the surrounding four Jina Buddhas, Ratnaketu in the east, Sarīkusumitarāja in the south, Amitābha in the west, and Divyadundubhimanegetichoṣa in the north. The Yoga Tantra, on the other hand, is represented by the Sarvatathāgatatattvasarirgraḥa, which is considered to have been completed around the beginning of the eighth century (Matsunaga 1969: 68). The text describes a manḍala called the bajradhātu-manḍala (Diamond World Mandala). The core of the manḍala consists of the main deity Mahāvairocana in the centre and the four surrounding Jina Buddhas, Aksobhya in the east, Bajrasarībhawa in the south,

52 The Sanskrit text does not seem to have survived. However, the Sanskrit title is noted in the Tibetan translation, which is the Mahā-vairocanābhisambodhivikurita-adhiṣṭhāna-vaiśputrayaśūnādhipatiadhirāja-nāmadharmaparyāya. The tantra has been estimated to be made around the middle of the seventh century (Matsunaga 1969: 57).

53 The manḍala is often called the garbhadhātu-manḍala. But this is a later modification by Japanese Buddhists in the late ninth to tenth centuries after the fashion of the bajradhātu-manḍala.
Amitāyus in the west, and Amoghasiddhi in the north. In the following argument, I shall refer to this fivefold pattern as “quincunx”, which exactly means what the pattern represents, that is, the arrangement of five objects in such a way that four are at corners of a square and the fifth at its centre, as in the five on dice.

While the lesser two Tantras eventually lost popularity in India, the ideas in the Yoga Tantra were adopted in the Anuttarayoga Tantra. This accounts for the dominance of the bajrādhetu-mañḍala in the Anuttarayoga Tantra. Moreover, the Anuttarayoga Tantra is characterized by the appearance of the female principle in conjunction with the male principle. The union of male and female principles is the essence of this Tantra. When the female principle appears in the text as a female partner in yogic practice, it is called prajñā in Buddhist tradition, although the word sakti, which is used in the Hindu terminology, is often erroneously applied to the Buddhist one (Snellgrove 1987: 132). The first indisputable introduction of the female partner into Buddhism took place in the Guhyasamājatāntra, one of the major Anuttarayoga Tantras, which is estimated to have been completed in the second half of the eighth century (Matsunaga 1969: 86). In this text five Jina Buddhas constitute a mañḍala with Aksobhya as the central figure and each of them except for Aksobhya is assigned a female partner (Matsunaga 1969: 89).

The First Mañḍala in the Sutasoma Narrative

Turning to the Sutasoma narrative, there are, in fact, not just one but two occasions on which the mañḍala concept is used to turn a particular space in the story into a symbolic space. Both assume, to a varying degree, the characteristics of the mañḍala we have seen above. The first mañḍala is found in stanzas 52.12–54.5. When Sutasoma is deeply absorbed in meditation at the top of the mount Meru, Indra, transformed into a beautiful goddess, attempts to seduce him with feminine charms in

---

54 Wayman, however, suggests that the text may have been present as early as in the fourth century (1973: 12–19).
order to interrupt his meditation. At that moment, Sutasoma is transfigured to the form of the Supreme Buddha Wairocana:

53.12 He [Sutasoma] assumed the divine appearance of the Śrī Wairocana, being at the summit of tranquility, seated in the lotus-seat posture on the seat of the jewel-lotus, endowed with the marks of the Buddha, gracefully adorned with all kinds of shining jewels and with the crown of splendid and shining jewels. The supreme deities headed by Aksobhya had already worshiped him, shouting “jaya, jaya” (victory).

53.13 All of sudden Surendra [the god Indra] carefully cast off his deceptive form in order to pay homage with folded hands. A host of the kings of gandharwa and apsara, each escorted by an excellent celestial nymph, with the great sage Nārada in the first place, all paid homage with the folded hands at the feet of the god Jinarāja [Warirocana], having the sacred syllable, the song of praise, incense, lamps, fragrant ointment prepared for him.

In this scene, the features of a marudala are all present. The centricity of the space is expressed by the fact that the scene is situated at the centre of the world, Mount Meru, which at the same time represents a sacred space separated from the profane world. Furthermore, centricity in relation to the four cardinal points is referred to in the gods’ praise of Wairocana (53.5): “Like gates leading to the mountain are the actions of those who worship you [=Wairocana]. [Just] the summit is aimed at [in yogin’s mind] from the east, south, north and west” (Iwir dwārāngusi parwatolah ira sang mangarcana kita, sangkeng pûrwa ri daksinottara ri paścināgra kinēñēp). In the middle of this setting, the supreme deity Wairocana reveals himself within the yogin Sutasoma. We have already seen that the summit of Mount Sumeru is regarded as the place where

55 For “dhara” (holding) in Soewito-Santoso’s edition, read “dwāra” (gate), as in Zoetmulder’s dictionary under “usi” (1982: 2148).
Wairocana pronounces the teachings of the Yoga Tantra. Furthermore, although the description of the scene contains no reference to the royal palace, it is apparent from the description of Wairocana’s appearance that his divinity is closely associated with kingship.

The hierarchical relation between the supreme deity and other beings is seen in the description of Wairocana surrounded by Aksobhya and other deities, demigods and the sages, who worship him. It is also referred to in a different way in the gods’ praise of Wairocana (53.2–3). In it, Sutasoma–Wairocana is equated with Parameśwara (Śiwa) among the Tripūrāśapati (Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiwa), Śākyamuni among Ratnatraya (Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha), Śiwa among the Pāñcapitāmaha (the five great ancestors?), Wairocana among the Pāñcasugata (the

56 The mountain as the locus of the main deity is not confined to the Yoga Tantra. A Kriyā Tantra practice named the Generation of Deity in Front also describes a detailed procedure to conjure up the image of Mount Meru in which the invoked gods are invited to reside (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 174–5). According to the procedure, the yogin must first imagine an earth surface on which an ocean of milk is imagined. In the middle of the ocean, then, he imagines Mount Sumeru with four sides, each of which is equipped with a stair made of gold, silver, sapphire and amber respectively. Wish-granting trees (kalpa-वृक्षa) decorated with a thousand of victory banners shoot up over the mountain. The summit of the mountain is covered by a canopy. On top of that canopy the yogin generates an eaved palace (kūṭāgārā) furnished with various seats inside. After the completion of the image of the mountain, deities are invoked and invited to the imaginary palace to be greeted with offerings and praising. Thus, the description clearly indicates that in Tantric Buddhism in general the top of Mount Sumeru is the locus where deities are invoked and worshiped.

57 The image of Wairocana crowned and adorned with jewels must have been well-known in ancient Javanese society, for there are some Javanese bronze sculptures of Wairocana which show similar features (Ishii 1989: 67). For example, a Buddha Wairocana sculpture, considered to originate from the late Central or early East Javanese period (the late ninth to the first half of the tenth century), is enthroned and adorned with jewelry (Lunsingh Scheurleer and Klokke 1988: 93, plate no. 41).

58 The meaning of “Pāñcapitāmaha” is uncertain (Zoetmulder 1982: 1267).
five Jinas), and Prțtaiñjala among the Pañcarēṣi (the five sages).59 The equation of the five Jinas (pañcasugata) and the five Hindu gods is elaborated later in the gods’ statement to the man-eater Poruṣāda, who is manifestly possessed by Rudra, the fierce aspect of Śiwa, and is about to destroy the whole world (139.6). According to this, in addition to the equation of Wairocana with Śiwa (in the form of Sutasoma and Poruṣāda), the four Jinas, Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi are equated with the four Hindu gods Īśvara, Dhātā (Brahmā), Mahāmara and Viśnu respectively.60 Thus, although Wairocana appears as the central deity in the two major types of maṇḍala, the garbhakoṣa-maṇḍala and the bajradhātu-maṇḍala, the presence of Akṣobhya in stanza 52.12 and the configuration of the five Jinas in stanza 139.6 suggests that the maṇḍala in the narrative is based on the bajradhātu-maṇḍala. The presence of the bajradhātu-maṇḍala indicates that the scene of Mount Meru represents either the Yoga Tantra or its later development, the Anuttarayoga Tantra. It appears, however, that the rigorous avoidance of the female element in Sutasoma’s meditation indicates that in all probability the scene represents the Yoga Tantra, whereas the

59 Prțtaiñjala is normally known as Patañjala, one of the Pañcakuśika (the five Kuśika), deified sages (Zoetmulder 1982: 1265–6).

60 Exactly the same equation of the five Jinas and Hindu gods is found in the kakawin Kuñjarakarna (23.1–4). In the kakawin the five Jinas, Wairocana, Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha and Amoghasiddhi are equated with the Pañcakuśika, that is, Patañjala, Kuśika, Garga, Metri, Kurushya respectively. This indicates that Prțtaiñjala of the Pañcarēṣi in the kakawin Sutasoma is the same as Patañjala of the Pañcakuśika in the kakawin Kuñjarakarna. Furthermore, in Tantular’s other kakawin Arjunawijaya the same equation of the five Jinas and Hindu gods is found. In the description of a Buddhist temple (26.4–27.1), it is said that there are the images of Wairocana, equated with Śiwasadā, in the centre, of Akṣobhya, equated with Rudra, in the east, of Ratnasambhava, equated with Dhātṛ (Brahmā), in the south, of Amitābha, equated with Mahādeva, in the west, and of Amoghasiddhi, equated with Hari (Viśnu), in the north. This fivefold arrangement suggests that Mahāmara in the Sutasoma, as well as in the Kuñjarakarna, is a variant of Mahādeva, an epithet of Śiwa. If Mahāmara is in fact Mahādeva, then the fivefold arrangement of the five Hindu gods in the Sutasoma is the same as the arrangement of the gods known as nawa sanga in the present Bali (Pott 1966: 135).
second *mandala*, which clearly shows the involvement of the female principle, indicates its close connection to the Anuttarayoga Tantra\(^\text{61}\).

Sutasoma's transfiguration to the Supreme Buddha Wairocana is without doubt an important turning point of the story. The event testifies that the hero has succeeded in attaining the ultimate truth, which consists not only of wisdom, gained from the intensive meditation, but also of compassion, cultivated through his encounter with the three creatures. In this sense, the moment of transition, Sutasoma's manifestation of Wairocana-ness, is in fact merely the final recognition of what he has already gone through during the rite of separation. The encounter with Gajawaktra, for instance, represents on the one hand the destruction of ignorance in the mind of the initiate, and demonstrates on the other hand the hero's unsuppressible compassion for other beings, those who suffer from the monster's assault as well as the monster himself, who is blind to the consequence of his sinful deeds. The utter selflessness of Sutasoma's compassionate actions is clearly demonstrated by the fact that he does so even when he can anticipate that in doing so his ultimate objective, enlightenment through meditation on Mount Meru, may be jeopardized. Furthermore, Sutasoma's sermon to the three creatures too should be seen not only as an indication of his deep knowledge about religious matter but also as an expression of his compassion, which urges him to impart his knowledge to others for their own well-being. Thus, although Sutasoma's initial goal is to release himself from this world, the attainment of enlightenment inevitably, and somewhat ironically, causes him to return to this world, for it is the integration of wisdom and compassion that constitutes the essence of the Buddha nature.

Therefore, when the gods request Sutasoma to return to this world, he is ready to agree, as the historical Buddha did before him. The difference between the two,

---

\(^{61}\) O'Brien also suggests that the first and second *mandala* in the Sutasoma *kakawin* may represent the Yoga Tantra and Anuttarayoga Tantra respectively (1988-89: 174).
however, is that while the Buddha, who confined himself to the domain of religious activities, stayed outside the secular social order, Sutasoma is to become a king, whose responsibility is to protect world and procreate royal offspring. In this context the Buddhist notion of *buddha-kāya* provides theoretical grounds for Sutasoma's twofold character as Buddha-Cakrawartin, for Sutasoma's manifestation as Wairocana in the *bajradhātu-maṇḍala* indicates that he is in reality the *nirmāṇa-kāya* of Wairocana. This alone, however, is not sufficient to legitimize his kingship, in which the sexual relationship with the female consort plays an important role as a source of royal power and means of procreation. To do so, Sutasoma now has to proceed to the second *maṇḍala*, which is set in the Anuttarayoga Tantra, highest stage of the Buddhist Tantric system.

**The Second Maṇḍala in the Sutasoma Narrative**

The second *maṇḍala* is represented in the section which relates Sutasoma's marriage to Candrawati in Ratnālaya, the pleasure garden of the kingdom of Kāśi (66.1–84.4). The section demonstrates Tantular's considerable poetical skill in incorporating complex religious ideas into a cohesive narrative structure. When Sutasoma is on the way back from Mount Meru to the kingdom of Hastina, he encounters in the forest his cousin Daśabāhu, the king of Kāśi. Daśabāhu immediately offers his younger sister Candrawati as wife to Sutasoma and invites him to the kingdom of Kāśi to celebrate the wedding. After some hesitation, Sutasoma accepts the offer and travels with Daśabāhu to Ratnālaya, where the wedding is to be held. Meanwhile, Daśabāhu's consort and his three sons, receiving a message from the king, escort Candrawati to the garden.

The garden, situated around a lake, is replete with beautiful flowers. However, what attracts the people's attention is an island in the middle of the lake, which looks as if Viṣṇu's heaven has descended to the earth (66.6). The island has four gates in the shape of *makara*-pincers (*sinupit makara*), inlaid with gold and jewels (67.1). Inside the gates, there are five pavilions arranged in quincunx. The eastern pavilion is
compared with the abode of Iśwara, the southern with that of Dhātra (Brahmā), the western with that of Mahāmara, the northern with that of Madhusūdana (Wiśṇu), and the crystal pavilion (sphaṭikawesma) in the centre with the paradise of the Buddha, who is said to be the Supreme Śiwa (paramārtha Śiwa) in his divine form (67.2). The direction and the name of god assigned to each pavilion is in complete accordance with the quincuncial configuration of the five Hindu gods in stanza 139.6. The symbolic nature of the island is emphasized by the way character–focalizers see it. As Candrawati gazes at the crystal pavilion from a distance, in her eyes it becomes “boundless” (tan pamātra) and the whole island has the appearance of an “immaterial island” (sūkṣmanūsa) (68.2). Then she tells Surāga, her trusted female companion, of her anxiety about entering the island, as she has learned the story about the island. The princess says that:

69.3 The gods Indra and Tripurusā (Brahmā, Wiśṇu and Śiwa) are not allowed to wander and take pleasure in amusing themselves there on the famous island. They do not wish to do so out of fear and great respect for the prohibition, because it is said that it is the garden of the king of the Jinas (Jinapati).

69.4 ... The water of the lake is deep as the sea and there is no point to cross. In the old times many kings were killed and their boats sunk, because they were completely wrecked by four terrible wild crocodiles (wuhaya).

Surāga promptly assures Candrawati that Sutasoma is in fact the incarnation of Jinapati, the Supreme Buddha Wairocana, who is superior to the gods Brahmā, Wiśṇu and Śiwa and advises her to prepare herself for marriage with him without fear (69.6–11).

It is Daśabāhu, a more reliable character–focalizer, who provides further information about the island, for he is said to have been informed about the island by the god Indra in meditation (68.4). After introducing Candrawati to Sutasoma, he explains that:
72.2 In the old times the story of the crystal pavilion (sphatikagrha) and the superb island was famous. The god Jinarāja, the king of the gods (dewapati), the highest god of one’s choice (iṣṭidewatā), who was incomparable and enthroned, had this place as divine abode with Jineswari. It is known that because in the irreproachable pleasure garden there were dangerous and extraordinary crocodiles (wuhaya) in the lake,

72.3 nobody could go there, and its beauty (kalango) was inaccessible. It is said that all of the gods were afraid of committing the sin of violating the teacher’s bed (gurutalpaka). The gods Rawi (the sun) and Candra (the moon) did not enter the middle of the garden directly but circumambulated it clockwise to pay respect (pradaksīna).

Daśabāhu then points out that Sutasoma is the only person who is able not only to enter the island and but also to make it open to others, for he is a descendant of the Bhārata and the incarnation of Jina (72.4). He further explains that the reason he offers Candrawati to Sutasoma is that she is in reality the incarnation of Wairocana’s consort, Locanā (72.5), and advises Sutasoma that he and Candrawati should act like the god of love Manmatha and his consort Ratih, and enjoy the reward of becoming king and that he should not return to the Absolute (nirāśraya) before serving the world. Hearing this, Sutasoma, who has been in love with Candrawati since he saw her, realizes that she was his wife in the abode of the Buddha when he was giving instruction in the dharma (dharmadesana) on the island (72.7).

When Sutasoma and others approach the lake, the four crocodiles, which have been protecting the island, appear.

73.1 Then in a moment the four crocodiles (wuhaya) quickly left the water and came onto the land. At the sight of the incarnation of Jina they were so filled with delight that they changed themselves into horrible demons (rākṣasa). Devotedly they prostrated themselves at the feet of the prince, saying that they were the gate-guards (dwārapāla) who had descended from the abode of
Buddha. They then said, “On your orders we have been guarding the excellent island carefully.

73.2 But now you are here. What can we do for you?” / “Now I wish you to become a pathway (marga),” replied the prince. / Instantly the four crocodiles returned to the island and became iron bridges. / Inlaid with jewels and gold, their radiance was like that of rainbows descending into the water.

Thus, because of the power of Sutasoma, the island, which has been previously forbidden even to the principal Hindu gods, becomes accessible to all the people, who rush from all directions to reach the island first and marvel at its beauty. A magnificent camp (kuwu) is set up to accommodate the people at night. It is well equipped for the king to retire to and has outer walls and nine-storied gates guarded by the soldiers, and many small buildings (rangkang) are set up, which are as beautiful as the palace (puri) (73.14).

On the following day the wedding ceremony is held with great pomp (79.2–80.5). The pavilions are beautifully decorated and a splendid bridal chamber is set in the crystal pavilion. The offerings for the wedding, consisting of various kinds of flowers and fruits are attractively arranged. The god Indra appears before king Daśabāhu and tells him that the crystal pavilion has been specially decorated by the demigods under his command and that the wedding must be immediately performed while Sutasoma is overcome by the God of Love.62 After the ceremony Sutasoma and Candrawati emerge from the temple, looking, in the eyes of the audience, like the god of love Smara and his consort Ratih. Flowers rain down from the sky and the sound of weda, mantra and the praise of the gods in the sky and the sages resound. The ceremony is concluded with a feast before night falls.

62 One group of the demigods who visited the crystal pavilion on the eve of the wedding is widyādhara. It is interesting to note that even in the present Javanese tradition the night before the wedding is called the lenggahan midadareni and the bride and groom, who are awake until midnight, are believed to contact the widadari and receive her blessing (Koentjaraningrat 1985: 130).
On the night of the wedding Sutasoma and Candrawati consummate their marriage in the bridal chamber prepared in the crystal pavilion. The moment is an important one in the narrative, for it is in this moment that the true identities of Sutasoma and Candrawati are recognized as Wairocana and Locanā by both characters and the union of the two is accomplished. In the bridal chamber Sutasoma tells Candrawati that he is Wairocana and she is Locanā and that he will never leave her to return to asceticism in the mountain for it is she who is the goal of his asceticism on Mount Meru:

83.6 ... /Moreover, as you [Candrawati] know, what was aimed at in my [Sutasoma’s] asceticism was to meet you as the consequence of my aim.

83.7 Oh darling, remember, my dear, that you were joined in love with me in the abode of Jina (Jinālaya). I am Wairocana and you are Locanā, the paramount of the beautiful goddess as the object of devotion. In short, how could I possibly have a right to leave you in order to grasp the secret of the asceticism. Only if I am satisfied with your beauty, I will be liberated and, as the fruit of my life, I will return to the Absolute (nirātmaka).

Then he explains to her that the reason he has abandoned the union with her in the abode of Jina and descended to the earth in a human form was not because of the cycle of rebirths (bhawacakra) or predestination or a curse, but because of his compassion toward the world (83.8). Candrawati finally recalls that this marvellous garden was the place where she enjoyed beauty with Mahājina (84.1), and, absorbed in passion, allows herself to be deflowered by Sutasoma.

It is evident that the description of Ratnālaya clearly shows that the entire arrangement of the garden is in accordance with the definition of a mandala proposed by Pott. Centricity is seen in the concentric arrangement of the garden, in which the miraculous island is situated in the middle of the lake, which in turn is surrounded by the outer-part of the garden. In addition to the prohibition on entering the island, the lake, inhabited by the guardian crocodiles, and the four gates on the island naturally
constitute a symbolic border between the sacred inside and the profane outside. The sacredness of the garden is furthermore marked, as we have seen in chapter three, by the presence of the mystical tree \textit{kalpadruma} (wishing tree) and \textit{parijata} (coral tree) (67.6). The path from the outside to the inside is opened only when Sutasoma turns the crocodiles into the bridges in the form of a rainbow crossing the lake.\textsuperscript{63} The fact that ordinary people can cross the bridges and reach the island does not contradict the nature of \textit{maṇḍala}, for it has been established in Tantric tradition that the uninitiated may enter a \textit{maṇḍala}, though he or she is not allowed to participate in the rite of initiation itself (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 145).

The structure of the island is precisely aligned with the four cardinal points, for the four bridges lead, through the four respective gates, to the four divine pavilions which are located respectively in the east, south, west and north of the island. While these four pavilions represent the abodes of the four Hindu gods, the fifth pavilion, situated in the very centre of the island, represents the abode of the Buddha, who is equated with the Supreme Śiwa. The garden, thus, can be envisaged as the cosmic hierarchy. Furthermore, the imagery of a splendid palace, a common feature of a \textit{maṇḍala}, representing the spiritual sovereignty of the Supreme Buddha, can be more clearly recognized in this \textit{maṇḍala} than in the first \textit{maṇḍala}.\textsuperscript{64}

What makes the second \textit{maṇḍala} distinct, however, from the first \textit{maṇḍala} is the way the hierophany of the supreme deity Wairocana takes place in the centre of the \textit{maṇḍala} structure. In the first \textit{maṇḍala} only Wairocana is involved in the hierophany.

\textsuperscript{63} The episode of the transformation of a crocodile into a bridge over water is also found in the \textit{kidung} Śri Tañjung (4.121–2). The rainbow, on the other hand, was widely regarded as a symbolic bridge between this world and that world, and was often depicted in the shape of \textit{nāga} (Snodgrass 1985: 282–6). It seems that the episode in the Sutasoma is a result of combining the two concepts.

\textsuperscript{64} For instance, one Tantric Buddhist text states that in the midst of a \textit{maṇḍala} “one sees a palace with a single courtyard and made entirely of jewels—with four corners, four gates, decorated with four arches, having four altars, and radiant with nets and so on, with nymphs” (Wayman 1973: 83).
The yogin Sutasoma achieves spiritual union with the Supreme Buddha, thus establishing his identity as the supreme deity, when he transforms himself into Wairocana in steadfast meditation. Whereas, in the second *manḍala* it is the supreme male and female Buddhist deities, Wairocana and Locanā, who are united in the hierophany, as Sutasoma, already identified as Wairocana, and his consort Candrawati, who now recalls her true identity as Locanā, achieve sexual union.

The notion of oneness, which is already inferred in the first hierophany but more graphically represented in the second hierophany as the union of the male and female principles, is closely related to the fundamental Buddhist conception of *adwaya* (non-duality). The origin of the concept may be traced back in early Buddhism to the interdependency of the two Buddhist principles, *praṭiṣṭhā* (supreme wisdom) and *karuṇā* (compassion), which, when fused together, constitute *bodhicitta* (the enlightened mind) (Bhattacharyya 1980: 101–3; Dasgupta 1950: 100ff.; Bharati 1965: 199–227). *Prajitā* is usually interchangeable with *śūnyatā* (the void), and *karuṇā* with *upāya* (the method). *Prajitā* is called *śūnyatā* because only perfect knowledge can grasp the ultimate reality as the void. Bhattacharyya gives a succinct description of how *prajitā* sees the world (1980: 102):

Śūnyatā consists in thinking, or realizing, all worldly phenomena as transitory, momentary, non-ego, mistaken as realities by the mind, similar to objects seen in a dream or magic, endowed with inherent purity, non-existent, unborn and void, like the place of the Tathatā (thatness).

*Karuṇā* on the other hand is termed *upāya* (the method) because it is the means of attaining perfect enlightenment. It is defined in Tantric works, but equally relevant to Mahāyāna Buddhism in general, as “the determination on the part of the Bodhisattva to lead to Nirvāṇa (and finally to place) all beings” and also as “a strong determination to diffuse right knowledge among the people who, owing to desire (Trṣṇā), are blinded by ignorance, and cannot realize the continuous transmigration caused by the act-force” (Bhattacharyya 1980: 102). Thus, *prajitā* is absolute knowledge, which is
passive by nature and by means of which the bodhisattwa realizes ṣānyātā, whereas karunā is the active and dynamic principle, which enables the bodhisattwa to be engaged in the salvation of beings in this world through the utilization of upāya. It is in this broader context that adwaya (non-duality) can also mean the non-duality of the absolute truth and the phenomenal world.

Although the two principles have been placed in the key position since early Buddhism, it is in Tantric Buddhism that the pair obtained special significance as the emphasis was put on the non-duality of the two principles. Dasgupta asserts that “in all classes of Buddhist Tantras (i.e. Indian and Tibetan) the most important matter is the stress on this union of Prajñā and Upāya, either in the philosophical sense or the esoteric yogic sense,” because, as the renowned Buddhist teachers said, “Upāya is bondage when unassociated with Prajñā, and even Prajñā is bondage when unassociated with Upāya” (Dasgupta quoted in Bharati 1965: 209). It is, however, in the most advanced class of Tantric Buddhism that the non-duality of prajñā and upāya is represented by the copulation of male and female participants in the manḍala, with prajñā being conceived as the female principle and upāya the male principle.65 Mkhas-grub-rje’s Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras expounds it thus (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 142–4):

The one of the Anuttara Tantra also has the Great Seal, the body of the deity, but it is necessary in addition to produce a vidyā [wisdom, i.e. female partner] like Vajradhatviśvarī. Then the union “bliss-void” by embracing that [vidyā] is the main part of the Hierophant’s Initiation, just as is said in the Hevajra-tantra: “He embraces with his two hands the sixteen year old Insight

---

65 This is contrary to Hindu tradition where the female deity usually represents the active principle (Sakti), while the male deity represents the passive and inert principle. This Hindu conception can be traced back to prakṛti and puruṣa in Sāṁkhya philosophy (Bharati 1965: 204–7). Nevertheless, as we shall see in the next chapter, in ancient Javanese society a king’s consort assumed the active characteristic of Sakti in the legitimation of kingship.
(prajñā). By the union of thunderbolt and bell the Hierophant’s Initiation is understood.”

Hence, by no means do the three lower Tantra divisions [Kriyā, Caryā and Yoga Tantra classes] seek for a concrete vidyā or explain at all the creation of a meditative object involving the embrace and equipoise with a contemplated goddess.

The sexual union of the yogin and his female counterpart as the ritual representation of the non-duality of prajñā and upāya, from the union of which emerges the thought of enlightenment (bodhicitta), is also illustrated in a rather graphic fashion in the descriptions of the most advanced consecrations (abhiṣeka) of the Anuttarayoga Tantra (Snellgrove 1987: 243–5):

[Wisdom] is the feminine counterpart of Means (upāya), for without the Means, Wisdom remains unattainable. The Means as we have seen is the form of the practitioner’s chosen divinity with whom he must identify himself in the embrace of Wisdom. . . . Through the union of Wisdom and Means there comes the Thought of Enlightenment (bodhicitta), “produced simultaneously on both sides,” . . . and this is identified ritually with the drop of semen (bindu) at the tip of the vajra (the male organ) as it rests in the lotus (the female organ). It is with this “drop” taken “from the secret places of Wisdom and Means” that the master consecrates his pupil in the Secret Consecration by placing it on the tip of his tongue. Thus consecrated, the pupil may proceed to the next consecration, the Knowledge of Wisdom, when he knows Wisdom herself by being united with her. He experiences in her embrace external experience . . ., which through the ecstatic union becomes reabsorbed into the natural nondual state of absolute nonduality, as defined in Mahāyāna philosophical concepts.

It can be surmised without doubt, therefore, that Sutasoma’s realization of the state of non-duality through the sexual intercourse with his consort, in the same manner as their divine identities Wairocana and Locanā, indicates that the second maṇḍala is based on the Anuttarayoga Tantra.
One of the aspects which characterize the concept of non-duality is the fact that the concept is not an object to be discovered but to be re-discovered and realized within the yogin himself, for, as Zoetmulder rightly points out, "the aim of yoga is not so much to achieve a union that was previously non-existent, as to realize and become conscious of a union which already exists" (1974: 347). Thus, just as Sutasoma’s transfiguration in the first maṇḍala represents the recognition of his immanent identity instead of the acquisition of a new one, in the second maṇḍala Sutasoma as well as Candrawati come to realize the eternal oneness of themselves. This is most evidently highlighted in stanza 73.12, in which Sutasoma recalls that in former times he and Candrawati were never separated as they were one in the form of Ardhanārīśwara, the deity with a half male and half female body, symbolizing the inseparable unity of male and female principles.

Besides its association with Tantric Buddhism, explicit sexuality in the second maṇḍala is accounted for from a Hindu point of view by frequent references to the Hindu god of love and beauty Kāma and his consort Ratih as an imagery of Sutasoma and Candrawati. Seen as the embodiment of the divine couple, not only the physical beauty of Sutasoma and Candrawati but also their mutual affection and sexual intimacy are exalted. In fact, reference to Kāma as the imagery of a yogin engaged in sexual union with his female partner is not unknown in Tantric Buddhism. Lessing and Wayman, quoting Rāhula-śri-kalyāṇamitra’s work, describe that after the yogin embraces the female partner "he imagines himself with the form of the god of love

---

66 Although in Old Javanese literature the term Ardhanārīśwara, or its feminine form Ardhanareśwari, usually refers to Hindu deities, in particular Śiva with his consort Umā, a reference to Wairocana with Locana is also found in the Nāgarakṛtāgama. According to the text (43.6), the Singhasari king Kṛtanagara was consecrated after his death in Sāgala as the Jina in the form of Ardhanaresvarī, having the aspects of Wairocana and Locana.

67 References are made, with a variety of names for Kāma, in stanza 72.6 (Manmatha), 68.5 and 81.1 (Smara).
(kāmadeva or ṭakkirāja) embraced by vajradhātviśvari, the Great Seal (mahāmudrā) of the inner self” (Lessing and Wayman 1978: 142). Furthermore, in the kakawin Smaradahana it is told that Kāma and Ratih are destined to be incarnated several times on earth until finally they are born on Java as Kāmeśwara, the king of Dahana, and Kiraṇarātu, the princess of Janggala, to be reunited in marriage (Zoetmulder 1974: 295). The narrative, thus, enables the reader to perceive the sexual union of the prince Sutasoma and Candrawati not only as the union of Wairocana and Locanā but also as the union of Kāma and Ratih. However, the ontological superiority of Wairocana over Kāma, thus of Buddhist perception over Hindu perception is undeniable, for Wairocana incarnates himself at his own will, whereas Kāma has to be incarnated because of a predestination beyond his control. Nevertheless, the intertextual reference to Javanese kingship is an interesting one and requires further investigation in the next chapter.68

The Birth of the Buddha-King

Sutasoma as the Buddha-King

After the wedding, anxious about his parents in his homeland Hastina, Sutasoma decides to return to the kingdom with his wife. Daśabāhu gladly endorses the decision and offers to accompany them to Hastina. His entire court, his wife and three sons, army and ladies-in-waiting, all follow him. Thus, in marked contrast with Sutasoma’s first journey through the wana to Mount Meru, the journey to Hastina resembles more a royal pleasure trip, in particular when the people indulge themselves at a beautiful seaside, where they stay overnight during the trip. At the end of the journey, Sutasoma and his entourage are cordially welcomed by Sutasoma’s parents.

68 The author’s intention to relate Sutasoma with the Javanese kingship is evident in an incident in the first maṇḍala (53.3–4), in which Sutasoma–Wairocana is eulogized by the gods as to be the future Nāthagiri, who will be praised by all the rulers of Java (Yawabhūmi).
the king and queen of Hastina. Before long Sutasoma succeeds to the throne, as his father retires to the ascetic life, while Daśabāhu with his court choose to stay in Hastina as the guard (rakṣaka).

Sutasoma's succession to the throne of Hastina marks the completion of his long journey which began with his departure from the palace of Hastina. This journey, ranging from the pura (palace) through the wana (wilderness) to Mount Meru and then back to the pura, represents at the narratological level the hero's chronological progression, in the manner of a rite of passage, from unmarried prince to an ascetic who identifies himself with the Supreme Buddha Wairocana and finally to married king. The narrative, thus, is the representation of Platonic time not only because its theme is the hero's lifelong quest of true knowledge but also because the time and space in the narrative are inseparably related to this theme. The hero's progression also corresponds to his spiritual advancement from the uninitiated to the realization of his real identity as Wairocana in the first maṇḍala and then to the realization of oneness with his female partner in the second maṇḍala. In the Buddhist context, the two maṇḍala are indicative of the two Tantric Buddhist stages, the Yoga Tantra and the Anuttarayoga Tantra respectively. However, if we are to look for the most comprehensive way to describe the account of Sutasoma's journey, it may be to describe it as the process of Sutasoma's becoming Buddha-King, which we shall discuss below.

In the traditional Hindu concept of dharma, there has been a tension between two sets of moral objectives (O'Flaherty 1981). The first objective demands a man become a householder and beget sons to fulfil the dharma of marriage and procreation. The second demands that he renounce earthly life and seek mokṣa (liberation from the bonds of saṁsāra) through the union with god. Although this tension is typically a Hindu problematic, it is so fundamental to Indian religious thinking that Buddhism is not beyond the tension either. As we have seen before, the historical Buddha had to choose whether to become the Buddha or to become the Cakrawartin, for the life of the world renouncer and that of the world maintainer are not compatible. Thus, if a king
should declare himself to be a Cakrawartin, it is based on his claims to identity not with a Buddha but a bodhisattva, a Buddha-to-be, that he could legitimize his spiritual power.69

Another solution to the tension known in Hinduism is the distribution of the moral obligations over the four different stages of life (caturāśrama): the stages of brahmacārin (chaste student), grhastrā (married householder), wānaprastha (retiring into the forest) and sannyāsin (the ascetic who has completely renounced earthly life) (O’Flaherty 1981: 78). In the Sutasoma narrative this solution is advocated by Jayendra, the prime minister of Hastina, and the Buddhist sage Sumitra, who argue, in order to dissuade Sutasoma from leaving the palace, that he should become a married householder first to carry out his royal duty before renouncing life to attain liberation (5.1; 24.4–5). What they stand for is undoubtedly pertinent to the kṣatriya ethic, for in their arguments allusions are made to Yudhiṣṭhira, the son of the god Dharma and eldest of the Pāṇḍava brothers in the Mahābhārata, who sought liberation only after he had accomplished the duty of kṣatriya as king (4.1; 24.6). The life of Sutasoma’s father, too, is precisely modeled on the same lines as the life pattern represented by Yudhiṣṭhira.

The solution to the tension presented in the Sutasoma, however, is radically different from the two discussed above, for it is based on Tantric Buddhism. In Tantric thought the tension between the dharma of the world maintainer and the dharma of the world renouncer is transcended. O’Flaherty asserts that:

On the human level as well as divine, one solution to the conflict between sexual and ascetic behaviour was to equate them completely, playing upon the basic function of power which they share in Hindu thought, qualifying sexual activity in such a way as to make it entirely yogic in its application. (1981: 255)

69 See Tambiah for the equation of the Buddha and the Cakrawartin in the Theravada Buddhist kingdoms (1976: 96).
Although her assertion is about Tantric Hinduism, it is equally applicable to Tantric Buddhism. Thus, in the Tantric context, not only Sutasoma need not seek mokṣa, for he is already Wairocana, but also his sexual intercourse with his consort is nothing but a Tantric practice in which the realization of adwaya is achieved. Moreover, this same Tantric practice, on the other hand, enables Sutasoma to accomplish his social obligations, that is, marriage and procreation of a son.

**The Religious System in the Sutasoma Narrative**

Before finally returning with his consort to the Buddhist heaven, as the Buddha-King, Sutasoma restores social order, and brings peace and prosperity to the world. His particular achievement can be summarized in three points. Firstly, he reinforces the alliance of the kings who fight against the demons. Daśabāhu, the king of Kāśi, has already offered his sister Candrawati to Sutasoma and volunteered to become the guardian of the kingdom of Hastina. The other kings also pledge their allegiance to Sutasoma and give Sutasoma their princesses, whom Sutasoma duly accepts as wives. Secondly, with Candrawati he begets a son named Ardhana. The procreation of sons, the dharma of the householder, is in particular important for a king, for it maintains social order by ensuring the continuation of the dynastic line. In fact, only after the birth of Ardhana does Sutasoma’s father decide to retire to a life of asceticism. Thirdly, Sutasoma saves the world from the threat of the demon king Poruṣāda and the demonic deity Kāla. This is by far the most significant achievement of Sutasoma as Buddha-King. Although other kings may be able to form an alliance, as Sutasoma’s father does with Daśabāhu, and certainly can procreate offspring, they all fail to defeat the demons. Even Daśabāhu, the incarnation of Brahmā, and Jayawikrama, the king of Singhala, who is said to be the incarnation of Viśṇu, are

---

70 Moreover, Ardhana is said to be born from the mind (manasiṣṭa) (52.5). This indicates that he is not born of desire, like Gajawaktra, but of the adwaya yoga.
killed in battle by the demon king Porušâda. Not only does Sutasoma triumph over the demons but also he does so not by violently destroying them but by peacefully converting them to Buddhism.

The emphasis on the pacification of evil instead of the destruction of evil reflects the author Tantular's religious thinking. To investigate this, we shall discuss the religious system represented in the Sutasoma narrative. Since it is not our intention here to conduct a comprehensive survey of literary sources of the religious elements in this *kakawin*, or to reconstruct the religious system of ancient Javanese society, we shall necessarily confine ourselves in sketching the framework of the religious system in the narrative, and keep the number of references to other related texts minimal.

In his analysis on the late Majapahit *kakawin* Kuñjarakarna, Teeuw asserts that the *kakawin* represents the same religious system as the Arjunawijaya and the Sutasoma, and calls it the "Tantric Śiwa-Buddha system of the Majapahit period" (Teeuw et al. 1981: 9–10). According to him, in this religious system:

> Gods, doctrines, rituals and philosophical concepts deriving from various religions have their own rightful place. The text [Kuñjarakarna] itself explains that there is no basic difference between the various religions, and the religious sects are quite wrong in fighting amongst themselves about the question as to who is right and who is wrong, whose ādidewa is the highest, etc. (1981: 10).

Although at first glance the religious system of the Sutasoma *kakawin* may appear to agree with what Teeuw calls the "Śiwa-Buddha system", further investigation will indicate that the term "Śiwa-Buddha" is less than appropriate to describe the religious system of this *kakawin*.

1) The Preliminary Stage

In the Sutasoma *kakawin* three major stages can be distinguished in its religious system, according to the subject and the way of its representation in the narrative. The first stage is a preliminary to the following stages. It concerns good and
bad mental qualities and functions, which are to be either cultivated or eradicated in order to set up right mental conditions in which the initiate can advance to the further stages. These mental qualities and functions are: the six enemies ($at;fripu), the three stains (trimala), the three qualities (triguña), the four pious conducts (brahmāwihāra), and miscellaneous ones, including desire (trṣṭā), anger (krodha) and the five senses (pañcendriya). It is noteworthy that all of these concepts are also discussed in the Buddhist text Jinarthiprakti as preconditions for the attainment of enlightenment in the yogic meditation (Schoterman and Teeuw 1985). This similarity suggests that the description of the first stage of the religious system in the Sutasoma

71 The six enemies are mentioned as $acripu$ in 22.1 and 145.3, as $acdšaru$ in 146.3, and as triwighna (three obstacles) in 11.1 and 30.16. Although the Sutasoma kakawin does not detail the names of the six enemies, we can obtain relevant information from the Jinarthiprakti, in which they are called $acripu$ and $acdwarga$. According to the Jinarthiprakti, the six enemies are passion (rāga), hatred (dweśa), ignorance (moha), deceit (dambha), envy (irsyā) and jealousy (māisarya). The other Buddhist texts Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan and Sang Hyang Kamahāyānī Mantranaya, on the other hand, mention only the first three of the six enemies, which are called trikhala (Kats 1910: a12, a26, b40, b55).

72 The three stains are mentioned as trimala in 22.1, 145.3 and 146.3, and as triwighna (three obstacles) in 11.1 and 30.16. Again the Sutasoma kakawin does not mention the names of the three stains. According to the Jinarthiprakti, in which they are called trimala, they are material gain (artha), sensual pleasure (kāma) and fame (śabda).

73 Although the term triguña does not appear in the text, it has been well-established in Hindu tradition as a generic term for the three qualities, which appear in the text as anger (rajah, 30.15 and 139.18), ignorance (tamah, 29.1) and goodness (sattwa, 30.15, 31.7, 32.10 and 33.3).

74 The four pious conducts are called bhramāwihāra (literally “the abode of Brahmā”) in the Sutasoma kakawin (11.2) as well as in the Jinarthiprakṛti, although they are more commonly known as apramāṇā in Indian Buddhist texts. The names of the four conducts, benevolence (metrī), compassion (karunā), joy (muditā) and equanimity (upekṣa), are mentioned in 11.2, 139.18 and 143.1.

75 Desire (trṣṭā) is mentioned in 7.4, 142.1 and 146.3, anger (krodha) in 31.7, 33.3 and 146.2, and the five senses (pañcendriya) in 30.16 and 145.3.
kakawin may have been derived from this text. In any case, the fact that the Sutasoma kakawin does not detail the names of the six enemies and the three stains indicates that these concepts were well-known to the audience at the time of its composition.

The notion of preconditioning these mental qualities and functions before advancing to the the further stages appears to be fundamental to the religious system, for it is expressed many times at various narrative levels. When the goddess Widyutkarâli appears before Sutasoma, who is engaged in meditation in the graveyard, she praises him for having eradicated the six enemies and the three stains from his mind, and declares that the four pious conducts are his weapons to fight against evil (11.1–2). Then at the Buddhist hermitage, the sage Sumitra tells Sutasoma that Śuciloma, the former incarnation of Poruṣâda, was freed from the influence of the six enemies and the three stains when he was pacified by Agrakumâra, the former incarnation of Sutasoma (22.1). Afterwards these notions are mainly expressed in Sutasoma’s speeches. When Sutasoma encounters Gajawaktra, he warns the monster that the only way for him to avoid falling into the hell is to eliminate the accumulated rajah (anger) and tamah (ignorance) from his mind and cultivate sattwa (goodness) instead (30.15–16, 31.7). However, to pacify Gajawaktra, who will not listen to the advice, Sutasoma has to resort to the use of the bodhyagrimudra, which is in fact the essence of sattwa (32.10). Finally, when Poruṣâda and Kâla are pacified by Sutasoma, it is recounted in the narrative that the four pious conducts begin to grow in their minds (139.18, 143.1). And then in his sermon to the two pacified monsters, Sutasoma teaches them to eliminate rajah and tamah from their minds, and to destroy the six enemies, the three stains and the five sense, before finally teaching them about yoga mediation (145.3, 146.3).

The fact that all those who are pacified have to go through the first stage before being instructed in yoga meditation indicates that the first stage is prerequisite to the advanced stage. Furthermore, this implies that even those who are already in the stage of yoga meditation and therefore are in the possession of supernatural abilities may go astray, should they be overcome by the six enemies and so on. The danger of this is
expressed in Sutasoma’s teaching: “Even the tripuruṣa [Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva] would have their yoga brought to a halt, if they are not unwilling to give in (tripuruṣa tuwi kāndēg de ning yoga tar atēngėt) (146.1).

2) The Śāclanggayoga and the Adwayayoga

The second stage is the core of the religious system of the Sutasoma kakawin, which concerns the method of yoga meditation by which the yogin reaches liberation. This stage is expressed exclusively in Sutasoma’s two sermons, one to Gajawaktra, the serpent and the tigress, and the other to Poruṣāda and Kāla. Although the detail of the method of yoga meditation is described only in the first sermon, it is asserted in stanza 147.5 that Sutasoma’s instruction on yoga meditation is the same in both sermons. The fact that this stage is entirely represented in Sutasoma’s speech lends importance to the religious ideas expressed at this stage, for Sutasoma is undoubtedly the most reliable focalizer in the narrative. We may further presume, with due caution, that what is said here directly reflects Tantular’s religious thinking.

Sutasoma explains that there are two equally valid ways in the method of yoga meditation; śāclanggayoga (sixfold yoga) and adwayayoga (non-duality yoga). The śāclanggayoga consists of six parts (40.3–5). They are: pratyāhāra (withdrawal), dhyāna (meditation), prāṇāyāma (restraint of breadth), dhāraṇā (fixation), tarka (reflection) and samādhi (concentration). In his analysis of Sutasoma’s religious teachings, Ensink has come to the conclusion that the concept of śāclanggayoga was taken from Old Javanese Śiwaite texts (1974: 198–9). He also asserts that, although in other Old Javanese texts the six parts appear to be treated as separate yogas, in the Sutasoma kakawin they are conceived as the six stages of a single yoga system which the yogin goes through to attain liberation (1974: 199).

Adwayayoga, on the other hand, is closely related to the Buddhist text Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan, and it seems quite likely that, as Ensink asserts, Tantular used the latter as a source for the Sutasoma kakawin, for there are clear parallels between the two texts (1974: 202–7). Thus, although the description of adwayayoga
in the Sutasoma is vague at some points, it is possible that the contemporary reader could understand its meaning with the help of the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan. The essence of the adwayayoga, then, lies in the two sacred syllables “arṇ” and “aḥ”, representing inhalation and exhalation respectively. As the breath fills in the yogin’s body with the inhalation “arṇ”, the body becomes like the sun, whereas as the breath comes out of the body with the exhalation “aḥ”, the body becomes tranquil like the moon.76 When the sun and the moon appear, the thought of non-duality (adwaya-citta) arises in the yogin’s mind (41.2). This means, as Ensink rightly asserts, that “when through the exercise of inhalation and expiration the yogin has realized non-duality himself, he has immediate and full knowledge of non-duality” (1974: 205). And finally through the union of the non-duality and the knowledge of non-duality emerges the Lord Buddha (hyang Buddha in 41.2, bhaṭāra Buddha in 41.4), who is “having the form of void, having the body of sunlight, spotless, and the liberation without characteristics” (śūnyākāra diwānga nirnala sirāṇ nirbāṇa nirākṣaṇa) (41.2). The Lord Buddha is regarded, obviously in the context of Anuttarayoga Tantra, as the son born from the union of the non-duality as father (sang hyang adwaya ṛāma) and the knowledge of non-duality as mother (prajñāpārīmitebu) (41.4). The birth of the Lord Buddha, then, must be understood as “the yogin’s attainment of Buddhahood upon the full realization of non-duality” (Ensink 1974: 205).77

76 The two states of the body are called the “sun meditation” (smṛti-sūrya) and the “tranquil moon” (śānta-candra) in the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan. The use of the sun and the moon as the metaphor of the state of meditation appears to be common in ancient Javanese society, for it is also found in the Jinārthiprakṛti (2.13–14).

77 Bajrajñāna in the opening stanza, who is said to be “shining like the moon and sun in their fullness, wonderful when coming forth from the thought of enlightenment” (sākṣat candrārka pūrṇādhuta ri vijil irān sangka ring bodhicitta) (1.1), must be also understood as the Buddha in the highest reality (Ensink 1974: 205).
In his delivery of the teachings of the Śiwaite way and the Buddhist way, Sutasoma maintains impartiality, and at one stage he even states that the two yogas are complementary to each other (42.2). Nevertheless, it is clearly indicated that Sutasoma’s real preference is for the Buddhist way. In his first sermon Sutasoma tells that after completing the sadānggayoga, the yogin will attain the eight supernatural qualities (aṣṭa-guṇa) and “he may become not visible, then invisible, have power over the world, or assume the manifest form of Rudra” (40.6).78

However, Sutasoma warns that the attainment of these miraculous powers may become a hindrance to the yogin’s real goal, liberation from this world, for he may be deceived by the powers and eventually overpowered by sensual desires (60.4). This is precisely what happened to Gajawaktra and Porusāda. Both were ardent followers of Śiwa and, as a reward for their tireless asceticism, they were granted supernatural powers by the god. However, eventually they succumbed to sensual desires and started abusing their powers. In fact, the theme of the supernatural power granted by a god being abused by an inadequate ascetic is a recurrent one in kakawin literature. Rāwaṇa in the Arjunawijaya, who abuses the power granted by Brahmā to conquer the world, is a good example. On the other hand, Sutasoma himself chooses the way of adwayayoga, which is represented in the narrative as the sexual union of Sutasoma and Candrawati. Through this yogic union Sutasoma reaches the state of Buddha in the highest reality. Then, as Soewito-Santoso rightly argues, the fact that Sutasoma pacifies Gajawaktra and Porusāda and converts them to Buddhists unmistakably points to Tantular’s conviction that Buddhist way is superior to Śiwaite way (Soewito-Santoso 1975: 88–98).

78 The eight qualities (aṣṭa-guṇa) are also known as the eight supernatural powers (aṣṭaiśwaryā) (Ensink 1974: 219). The eight supernatural powers are enumerated in the Vṛhaspatitattwa (14.17): 1) aṇīmā (the power of becoming as small as an atom), 2) laghīmā (assuming excessive lightness), 3) namhīmā (increasing size), 4) prāpiś (obtaining everything), 5) prākāmya (irresistible will), 6) īśītwā (superiority), 7) wāsītwā (subduing to one’s own well), 8) yatrākāmāwasayitwa (transporting oneself anywhere one likes).
3) The Buddhist Pantheon and the Śiwaite Pantheon

It is in the third stage of the religious system where the equation of the Buddhist way and the Śiwaite way is the most unequivocally expressed. This stage represents, however, not so much the yogin’s spiritual progress, like the first two stages, as theological speculation on the equation of the five Jinas and the five Hindu gods. Since we have already discussed the matter in conjunction with the two *manḍala* in the Sutasoma narrative, we need not reiterate the quincunxial arrangement of the Buddhist and Hindu pantheons but discuss a few points relevant to our argument.

Firstly, we must take into account the question of “focalizer”. The most explicit expression of the equation of the five Jinas and the five Hindu gods is found in the statements of a host of Hindu gods led by Indra (53.2 and 139.5-6). Naturally the statements represent only what the gods regard as the truth. Whereas the superiority of the Buddha over Śiwa is not only represented in the plot, that is, Sutasoma’s pacification of Śiwa’s manifestations, but also expressed in Sutasoma’s speech, who is evidently the most reliable focalizer. Considering the reliability of the two kinds of focalizers, Hindu gods and Sutasoma, we may conclude that what the gods state in the narrative does not necessarily represent the religious system the author wholeheartedly wishes to advocate.

Secondly, there are two Old Javanese *kakawin* besides the Sutasoma which are known to express the equation of the five Jinas and the five Hindu gods. It is interesting to note that the contents of these two narratives, the Kuñjārakarnā and Tantular’s Arjunawijaya, is far from being exemplary of the Hindu religious system. Like the Sutasoma, the Kuñjārakarnā is a Buddhist narrative in the sense that the story is concluded with a Buddhist solution. The story of the Arjunawijaya is apparently not Buddhist in nature. However, as we shall discuss below, its conclusion is too ambiguous to regard the narrative as an endorsement of the Hindu system, either. In contrast, the Śiwarātrikalpa, the Old Javanese *kakawin* explicitly based on the Śiwaite belief, does not mention the equation at all. This may indicate that the equation of the
Buddhist and Hindu pantheons took place only in the circle of Buddhist literature. If this is the case, the simple expression of the equation of the two pantheons does not warrant the conclusion that in the Majapahit period Buddhism and Śiwaism were merged into the single “Śiwa–Buddha system”.

Thus, the religious system represented in the Sutasoma should be seen not as the “Śiwa–Buddha system” but as essentially the Buddhist system, which insists on the superiority of the Buddhist way over the Śiwaite one. The equation of the Buddhist and Hindu pantheons in this context, then, should be seen as an effort on the Buddhist side to incorporate the Hindu pantheon into the Buddhist system.

**Buddhist Ethic and Kṣatriya Ethic**

The significance of the concept of the Buddha–King is not confined to the realm of religion, in which the superiority of the Buddha over Śiwa is asserted. Equally importantly, in the realm of politics, too, the concept implies the superiority of a Buddhist ethic over a kṣatriya ethic. In the Sutasoma narrative, the kṣatriya ethic is most dramatically represented by the king Jayawikrama, the incarnation of the god Viṣṇu, and the king Daśabāhu, the incarnation of the god Brahmā, while the Buddhist ethic represented by Sutasoma, the incarnation of Wairocana.

The difference of the two ethics becomes apparent when the demon king Poruṣāda starts a campaign to capture one hundred kings as the sacrifice for the god Kāla. Having captured ninety-nine kings effortlessly, Poruṣāda now aims at the king of Singhala, Jayawikrama, as the last king to be captured. Although Jayawikrama is aware of Poruṣāda’s invincibility, he is resolute in his determination to fight the demons. In the court council Jayawikrama makes it clear that it is a king’s obligation to fight against an enemy and that to fall on the battlefield is his greatest honour (96.7–97.8). It is evident that what the king upholds is kṣatriya ethic, for the prime minister Pramoda, who supports the king’s decision, alluding to Kṛṣṇa’s advice to Arjuna in the Mahābhārata, says that “it is not proper for a kṣatriya to retreat from the battlefield”
After a fierce battle, the army of Singhala is crushed by the demon's army, and Jayawikrama engages in single combat with Poruṣāda. In the combat Jayawikrama, overpowered by Poruṣāda, realizes that his real identity is the god Wiśṇu (Cakrapāṇi) (101.11), but it is of no avail. Jayawikrama vanishes into the void, when he is slain by the demon king. The king's consort, who stabs herself to follow him in death, is reunited with him in the abode of Wiśṇu.

The confrontation between Daśabāhu and Poruṣāda takes place when Poruṣāda is told by Kāla to capture and sacrifice Sutasoma instead of the hundred kings whom Poruṣāda has already captured. As the demons approach the kingdom of Hastina, where Sutasoma reigns, a court council is held. Sutasoma acknowledges Poruṣāda's invincibility and proposes a peaceful solution, suggesting that he will offer himself to Poruṣāda to be sacrificed to Kāla in exchange of the lives of the captured kings and the peace of the world. The others, however, argue that a king's subjects cannot abandon the king and insist on a military action to defend the country. Furthermore, Daśabāhu, the commander-in-chief of Hastina, tells Sutasoma that if Poruṣāda assumes the form of Rudra, he, too, will assume the form of Brahmā. Daśabāhu's divine origin as the incarnation of the god Brahmā has been already recounted in the narrative (19.8–22.7). His statement is also strongly coloured by the ksatriya ethic (dharma), in particular when he says that:

117.5 In short, what is the reason to fear or surrender oneself to the powerful enemy. / If one is afraid of warrior's duties, he is called a man who detests the great heaven [mahāswarga]. / If he is not killed, he is not praised. It is better to die bravely in the battlefield. / Because the goal of life, they say, is to carry out dharma to be praised by the world.

79 This is the section of the Mahābhārata commonly known as the Bhagavadgītā.
Despite Sutasoma's strong opposition, the council decides on military action and the army leaves the palace. The campaign, however, is doomed to fail. Daśabāhu is slain by Poruṣāda in the single combat on a cosmic scale, in which both assume their respective frightful divine forms (*trīvikrama*). The entire army of Hastina is destroyed by the demon's army, except for Sucitra, Daśabāhu's second son, who survives to report the defeat of the army to Sutasoma.

The narrative which recounts the defeat of Viṣṇu's and Brahmā's incarnations by Śiva's manifestation and the pacification of the latter by Wairocana's incarnation is not so much about a sort of ranking the divine characters according to power as about indicating a fundamental inadequacy of the *kṣatriya* ethic in dealing with the force of evil. The *Kṣatriya* ethic stipulates that a *kṣatriya*, a warrior by definition, must not hesitate to use force if there is no other way to maintain social order. This is epitomized in the Mahābhārata, in which the four means to deal with enemies are discussed: *sāma* (negotiation), *dāna* (bribery), *bheda* (sowing discord among enemies) and *dāńca* (violent force). When the first three fail, the Pāṇḍawa brothers swiftly take the last means to settle the dispute with the Korawa (Zoetmulder 1974: 76). However, as the Sutasoma narrative acutely demonstrates, violent force, even though its intention is good and right, can be defeated by similarly violent evil force. Thus, there is no guarantee of the victory of good over evil.

The Buddhist ethic, on the other hand, makes Sutasoma take a completely different approach to the problem of maintaining social order. His action is always based on compassion (*karuṇā*), which is so unlimited that his concern is not only about the well-being of his own people but also about that of his enemies. Thus, instead of attempting to destroy the enemy, he sacrifices himself to satisfy the enemy's demand. This purely selfless compassion, combined in Sutasoma's mind with unclouded understanding of the ultimate truth, becomes a great spiritual power which pacifies the enemy.
The contrast between the policy of violent force (\textit{danda}) based on the \textit{kṣatriya} ethic and that of non-violence (\textit{ahimsā}) based on the Buddhist ethic, and a near impossibility of implementing the latter in practice has been long known to the Buddhists. Tambiah writes:

```
The symbol of dharma in political life for the Buddhists was the wheel (\textit{cakka}), which replaces the scepter of rod (\textit{danda}), the symbol for authority in the dharamashastric and Kautilyan doctrines. It is this total application of dharma to politics that in theory insisted on the principle of nonviolence (\textit{ahimsa}), noninjury and compassion (\textit{karuna}) in statecraft, an ideal that sometimes collided with the practicalities of statecraft. (1976: 41–2)
```

Because of this difficulty, as Tambiah suggests, Buddhist kings, as a rule, chose to concede that he was only a \textit{bodhisattva}. However, in the Sutasoma \textit{kakawin} the impossible becomes possible because the king is in reality the Buddha on the basis of Tantric Buddhism.

In this connection Tantular's thematic transition from the Arjunawijaya \textit{kakawin} to the Sutasoma \textit{kakawin} is suggestive. In the Arjunawijaya the demon king Rāwaṇa and the righteous king Arjuna Sahasrabahu play roles parallel to those of Poruṣāda and Sutasoma. Like Poruṣāda, Rāwaṇa's action, driven by insatiable lusts, is also characterized by arrogance. He abuses his supernatural power, granted by the god Brahmā through severe asceticism, to take over the kingdom of Lēngkā from its lawful ruler and to assault other kingdoms. Arjuna, on the other hand, is the righteous king, who is married (householder) and protects the prosperity and harmony of the kingdom. The difference with Sutasoma, however, is the fact that Arjuna is not the Buddha. When his kingdom is threatened by Rāwaṇa, he responds to it by a military action, \textit{danda}, in accordance with the \textit{kṣatriya} ethic. Arjuna eventually overpowers Rāwaṇa in a fierce combat, in which Rāwaṇa assumes the form of Kāla and Arjuna his \textit{triwikrama} form. Instead of killing him at once, Arjuna binds dejected Rāwaṇa with an iron chain and puts him in a cage.
The victory, however, turns out to be less than complete. The brahman Pulastya, Rāwana’s grandfather and the god Brahmā’s descendant, appears and begs Arjuna to spare Rāwana’s life. Arjuna duly agrees with the request and releases the demon, after giving him a lecture on good behaviour. Then, the narrative ends with the return of Arjuna and Rāwana to their respective kingdoms. But we know, as well as the contemporary reader, that Rāwana is not completely appeased, for he appears again as the villainous antagonist in the Rāmāyana kakawin, for which the Arjunawijaya, or more precisely its source the Uttarakanda, serves as the preface. Moreover, in the dialogue with Pulastya, Arjuna predicts that in the future he will be killed by the priestly incarnation of Wiṣṇu (72.1). This is Rāma Bhārgawa, also known as Paraśu Rāma, who kills every kṣatriya male, including Arjuna, in revenge for the killing of his brahman father by a kṣatriya king.80

Thus, despite its title “Arjuna’s victory”, the ending of the narrative is decidedly unsettled. The world maintainer, the kṣatriya king, proves himself to be incapable of restoring world order, while the world is divided into the realm of the righteous king and that of the evil-doer. Moreover, the tension between the world maintainer and the world renouncer remains unsolved. It is possible, as Worsley suggests, to recognize in this ironic twist of the story the priestly hand of the author Tantular (1991: 179). However, it seems that Tantular went beyond this point. Worsley also suggests a reading, according to which the Arjunawijaya and the Sutasoma constitute a literary series in the horizon of expectation (1991: 179). Then, in the Arjunawijaya Tantular raised the question of the inadequacy of kṣatriya order in the Sutasoma, in which Sutasoma, the Buddha-King, shows the way not only to

80 The episode of Rāma Bhārgawa is briefly recounted in the Ādiparwa (Supomo 1977; 332). The episode must have been well-known in ancient Javanese society, for it has been made into kakawin works in Bali, as well as into a number of literary works in the Surakarta court (Zoetmulder 1974: 402). It is also interesting to note that Zoetmulder attributes the popularity of the episode in Bali to the fact that the brahman poets found Rāma Bhārgawa’s victory over kṣatriya kings favorable to their own caste (1974: 404).
restore world order in a Buddhist way but also to transcend the difference between the world maintainer and the world renouncer.

In the hymn praising Sutasoma on the top of Mount Meru, the gods eulogize Sutasoma by identifying him with Wairocana and other divine beings. Then they say that:

53.3 In time to come you [Sutasoma] will be the bhaṭāra Girinātha to the entire world.

53.4 All the rulers on the island of Java [Yawabhūmi] will pay homage at your feet, and in the other islands [dwipāntara] there will be none other than you who is worshipped.

Supomo has identified this “bhaṭāra Girinātha” on the island of Java with Rājasanagara, the powerful Majapahit king, a contemporary of Tantular, who reigned from 1350 to 1389, for in the Nāgarakṛtāgama he is also called “Girinātha” (1.5) and “Sugata in his visible form” (Sugata sakala) (92.1) (Supomo 1977: 72–4). If this identification is correct, this is a clear signal by the author to the reader that a link has been established between the story and the society. Then, our next question: to what social condition was the Sutasoma narrative intended to be an answer? In other words, what was the social function of the Sutasoma narrative?
CHAPTER FIVE
KINSHIP, KINGSHIP AND KAKAWIN

The Function of Royal Consort

The term “social function” is inherently a general one. The religious elements discussed in the previous chapter, for instance, naturally had a certain social function in ancient Javanese society. However, considering the fact that most kakawin works, including the Sutasoma, were primarily created for and appreciated by a courtly audience, it is justifiable in this chapter to focus on a particular aspect of the function, the political implication of the narrative in the late fourteenth century Majapahit court. To this end, we shall draw attention firstly to the political and narrative significances of female royal consorts and then to the way they were obtained by a kin group, that is, we will discuss kinship system and marriage practice, in kakawin and kidung literatures and of the Majapahit dynasty. The investigation, I hope, will in the end lead us to an understanding of a thematic shift from the Arjunawijaya to the Sutasoma kakawin in the context of the horizon of expectation.

Sakti as Social Code

In the previous chapter we have seen the divine character of the hero Sutasoma as Buddha–King. But, however important this aspect of the king is for his legitimation, the grounds of his legitimacy are not fulfilled by it alone. In his analysis on ancient Javanese kingship, Weatherbee comes to the conclusion that in ancient Javanese society the queen was the personal manifestation of the royal sakti (energy) and the king needed to be “activated” by the union with the queen in order to become legitimate. Thus, the king who was not married was not only incomplete but undesirable. “It is this completion of divinity, the blending of dualist into the symbol
of totality, that is demanded in the royal marriage" (Weatherbee 1968: 454). Apparently the legitimizing function of the royal marriage is also represented in the Sutasoma narrative. However, the fundamental premise of the narrative that the hero who becomes the king is simultaneously the Buddha does give rise to a tension in this connection. The tension has two aspects. Firstly, even through the narrative's fundamental religious ideology is based on Buddhism, it is still impossible to avoid references in the narrative to Hindu ideology. Secondly, the tension is part of the contradiction, which we have discussed in the last chapter, between the ethic of world renouncer and that of world maintainer. Of course the Tantric notion of the Buddha-King is an answer to this contradiction, but problems do surface at several points in the narrative. In the following we shall discuss some problems associated with these tensions and how Tantular attempts to handle them in his narrative.

In Indian tradition, from its early stages, the function of the queen as the embodiment of royal authority and prosperity has been frequently compared to the goddess Śrī, also commonly known as Lakṣmi. Kinsley asserts that in Indian tradition the goddess “Śrī-Lakṣmi appears as the embodiment of royal authority, as a being whose presence is essential for the effective wielding of royal power and the creation of royal prosperity” (1988: 23). In earlier Indian myths Śrī-Lakṣmi was associated with the god Indra, the king of the gods. The presence of the goddess thus represents the royal authority of Indra. One version of the myth tells us that “when she sat down next to Indra he began to pour down rain and the crops grew abundantly. Cows gave plenty of milk, all beings enjoyed prosperity, and the earth flourished” (Kinsley 1988: 25). In later myths Śrī-Lakṣmi was increasingly associated with Viṣṇu as his consort, but the royal nature attributed to her was carried over from earlier myths.

In Old Javanese literature the words śrī and lakṣmi were used not only as ordinary nouns meaning “splendour”, “beauty”, “good fortune” and “the power (śakti) of the king” (Zoetmulder 1982: 959, 1818-9), but also specifically as the concept of royal power and prosperity. In this context, as in Indian tradition, the concept was
usually embodied as the consort of Wiṣṇu, as the Old Javanese Tantri Kāmandaka attests:

God Viṣṇu and His Consort are incarnate there. This is the fruit of the marriage. Everyday the gods are worshiped there. Forget that not. What is the result? It is the cause of welfare in the land, of plentiful rain, all plants thrive, and there is plenty in the land. (Quoted in Weatherbee 1968: 405)

In the Sutasoma narrative, too, despite Sutasoma and Candrawati’s real identity as Wairocana and Locana, the couple are compared to Wiṣṇu and Lakṣmi. One of the most striking instances is found in the scene where Sutasoma and Candrawati, who are just wed, rest at the seaside on the way back to the kingdom of Hastina, accompanied by the king Daśabāhu and his queen:

86.3 . . . / The arrival of the king [Daśabāhu] and queen / and the princess and the prince [Candrawati and Sutasoma] in truth unequalled in beauty / made the ocean seem even more and more marvellous to tell of.

86.4 For the princess was exactly like the goddess Śrī, followed by god Wiṣṇu, / emerging from the depths of the sea—so thought those who beheld them. / Goddesses from heaven [compared with her] would appear as just ordinary women making their audience. / . . .

The emergence of Śrī from the sea is an intertextual allusion to the well-known episode of the churning of the milk ocean, narrated in Indian and Javanese literature.1 In the episode, the gods and the demons, instructed by Wiṣṇu, churn the milk ocean to obtain amṛta (the elixir of immortality). From the churned ocean, among other precious mythical objects, the goddess Śrī emerges, whom Wiṣṇu gains possession

---

1 The episode is recounted in the Ādiparwa (Zoetmulder 1974: 69).
of as his consort. The allusion ensures the establishment of the perceived relationship between the would-be king Sutasoma and his consort as Viśṇu and Śrī-Łakṣmi.

The perception, however, apparently contradicts Sutasoma and his consort’s real identity as Wairocana and Locanā. The solution to this problem is found in the author’s narratological treatment of the perception. The phrase “so thought those who behold them” (hiḍep ning wvang umulat) in stanza 86.4 indicates that the scene is not directly narrated by the author–narrator but perceived or “focalized”, using a narratological term, by the court attendants, thus representing the conventional Hindu association of kingship with Viśṇu and his consort Śrī-Łakṣmi. The perception is undoubtedly valid in the Hindu context, but in terms of the Buddhist reality only illusory. Thus, by using different “focalizers”, the author is able to incorporate in the narrative different religious ideologies in a conceptual hierarchy.

Another and more dramatic instance of the tension in connection with the function of queen is found in the scene prior to Sutasoma’s departure from the palace. The tension this time is one between the ethic of world renouncer and that of world maintainer. When Sutasoma becomes marriageable, his father the king Mahāketu suggests to the people that “a princess who is the most excellent of women is a suitable gift for him [Sutasoma], in marriage.” The suggestion is unanimously supported by kings and clergy, for “the action he proposed was a pious one, from which would result the welfare of the world [jagaddhīta]” (3.8–9).2 The king’s proposition is

2 The term “jagaddhīta” is used on another occasion in the narrative in a different context. After leaving the palace, Sutasoma comes to the sage Sumitra’s hermitage, accompanied by the sage Keśawa. Keśawa introduces the prince to Sumitra by saying that: “His name is Sutasoma, the son of the king of Hastina, well versed in poetry, a protector of the law, possessed of all the best virtues in poetry, a protector of the law, possess of all the best virtues and expert in the highest sciences. He is like Iśvara in visible form, without equal in striving for the welfare of this world [jagaddhīta]” (17.4). Since this statement takes place after Sutasoma’s departure from the palace, apparently the means to achieve “jagaddhīta” is intended to be something other than kingly measures. The use of the term in the two contexts seems to suggest that there are two ways to achieve the welfare of the world; one by exercise of royal
completely congruent with traditional Hindu social practice. In Hindu tradition marriage or love (kāma) is counted among the four ends of human existence along with artha (material gain), dharma (righteousness) and mokṣa (liberation). Among the four the first three, including kāma, represent this-worldly values. The procreation of offspring as a result of kāma is crucial to ensure that the family line continues and the ancestors are properly worshipped.

In this context Sutasoma’s determination to renounce his this-worldly status of prince and become an ascetic is almost defiant, as we have seen in the last chapter. Only Sutasoma’s realization of his real identity as Wairocana can solve this fundamental difference between the ethic of world renouncer and that of world maintainer. By meditating on the top of Mount Meru Sutasoma’s spiritual pilgrimage reaches the stage of Tantricism, in which the yoga practitioner transcends the difference between this-worldly values and that-worldly values. Having reached this stage, sexual intercourse with the queen is metaphysically transformed into the highest stage of yoga performance, Anuttarayoga.

Interestingly, in the attempt to persuade Sutasoma to marry, the king’s statement betrays the anticipation of the Tantric aspect of sexual union. He says: “There is nothing more appropriate for you than to have wife, to be released in the sexual union [sanggama] of the Kāmatantra,\(^3\) to have a most virtuous son [putrātīdharmottama] as a result and to perform the buddhawijāksara mantra in the utmost enjoyment of the sexual union [padma dāṇḍa\(^{\text{V}}\)]” (4.4).\(^4\) Furthermore, the power (the way of Cakrawartin), the other by religious power (the way of Buddha). The emphasis should be placed on the similarity of the goal rather than on the difference of the measures.

\(^{3}\) In the Anuttarayoga stage the characteristics of the skill involved in yogic sexual practice are compared with those of the skill described in the Kāmasūtra (Lessing 1983: 320–1).

\(^{4}\) The translation is mine. Soewito–Santoso translates “padmadāṇḍa” as “pain”, which does not fit in with context. Zoetmulder’s comment on the definition “lotus–stalk (a kind of yoga?)” seems to have a point. Most probably the word means
purohita (chief court brahman) Mahosadhi talks to Sutasoma, supporting the king's argument but from a slightly different angle. He argues that because for the foremost pāṇḍita (learned sage) the place for yoga meditation is not important any more, even the palace can be as suitable as Mount Meru for the practice. He then recounts an episode about an ancient pāṇḍita for whom the act of sexual intercourse with women itself was the act of yoga. Obviously Mahosadhi's religious position is Tantric and his statement anticipates the future course of Sutasoma's life.\(^5\) Considering this Tantric connotation,\(^6\) it may be the case that the phrase "a most virtuous son" in the king's statement has, besides its obvious meaning, an esoteric meaning, that is, enlightenment attained by the yoga practice, for in Sutasoma's sermon the attainment of Buddhahood is compared to the son born from the union of the non-duality as father and the knowledge of non-duality as mother (41.4). Then the king continues, saying that: "If you [Sutasoma] are constant in so doing, you will make the world prosperous"(4.4).\(^7\) This is indicative of the king's acknowledgement of royal coitus with Tantric connotations, with "padma" and "daṇḍa" denoting female and male sexual organs. The sound of the buddhawijākṣara mantra, such as ah and hur̩, as Soewito-Santoso has rightly translated it, must be also understood in this context.

\(^5\) Sutasoma, however, refuses Mahosadhi's advice, because he thinks that although Mahosadhi's argument is right, there are too many temptations in the palace. In fact, it is only after his identification with Wairocana on the top of Mount Meru that Sutasoma's sexual act can be differentiated beyond all doubt as Tantric and distance from an ordinary one.

\(^6\) A similar Tantric overtone in regard to the union of a royal couple is also found in the Arjunawijaya. In the account of the sojourn at the river of Narmadā the love-making of the king Arjuna Sahasrabāhu and his queen is transformed into a Tantric practice (smaratantrayoga) (38.1).

\(^7\) It can not be completely denied that the king's discourse is delivered as mock or humour towards Tantric Buddhism, especially when we pay attention to the following speech in which the king talks about an evil pāṇḍita (learned sage) who was to be punished by a king for his mischievous deeds with women (4.6–8). However, even this is the case, the king's attitude towards Tantric Buddhism should not be
being the source of the well-being of the world. Here, the resolution of the tension between the Buddhist ethic of world renouncer and the Kṣatriya ethic of world maintainer is anticipated in the Tantric context. Royal coitus is seen as a yoga practice to attain enlightenment in one level and as the act of bringing in prosperity to the world in the other level.

*Sakri* at the Narrative Level

The notion of *sakri* may be noticeable not only in the perception of the hero’s sexual relationship with his royal consort but also in the very working of the narrative itself. Dimmitt suggests that the concept of *sakri* is the narratological function of the prime female character, the motivating power at the level of narrative which keeps the story moving by provoking her spouse-hero (Dimmitt 1986). Using the Indian Rāmāyaṇa as her evidence, Dimmitt asserts that in the story the heroine Sītā, despite her apparent passivity, is in fact the prime mover of the story. Although her discussion concerns the Indian versions, the conclusion is applicable to the Old Javanese version of the story. In both, Sītā is the one who insists on Rāma’s retreat with her to a forest, on Rāma’s capturing a golden deer which is actually Rāvana’s trap to kidnap Sītā, and on being rescued by none other than Rāma himself when she is first discovered by Hanūmān. Each moment is a crucial one inevitably pushing the story forward to its next moment. “Without Sītā there would be no story, not simply because she is a passive victim requiring rescue, but rather because she is instrumental throughout the epic in making the critical events of the story occur” (Dimmitt 1986: 219).

Dimmitt’s use of the term *sakri* as a kind of narrative force is of course foreign to its original meaning. Nevertheless her approach is of interest, for it may point to a

confused with that of the author-narrator, for the king’s view may be a narrative representation of laymen’s perception of Tantric Buddhism. We might be seeing here Tantular’s mockery towards laymen’s superficial understanding of Tantric Buddhism, in particular if we consider the *purohita* Mahosadhi’s position to be the one held by Tantular himself. Then this is another interesting instance where the author plays with different focalizations.
mode of, probably unconscious, reflection at the narrative level of the Hindu perception of the queen’s role, the agent who energizes the king’s royal power. The difference in the queen’s role as narrative force in Tantular’s two *kakawin* Arjunawijaya and Sutasoma, one Hindu and the other Buddhist in nature, seems to suggest this possibility. The narrative of the Arjunawijaya consists of three parts, the first being about the demon Rāwana and the second about the righteous king Arjuna Sahasrabahu. The third part, the encounter of the two protagonists, which leads to the climax of the narrative, is brought about by the king’s queen, Citrawati. At one stage during the sojourn at the river Narmadā the queen becomes depressed because the river is too deep, impassable and turbulent for people to enjoy catching fish which are in profusion in the river. To coax the queen, who refuses his sexual advances, the king assumes the *trīwikrama* form as huge as Mount Meru and lies down across the river to block its flow. As a result the riverbed becomes dried up downstream, enabling people to catch fish by hand. However, by blocking the stream the king causes a flood upstream, disturbing Rāwana who happens to be on an islet up river performing yogic meditation in the worship of the linga statue. Enraged by the interference which he takes as the utmost insult, the demon king orders his army to attack Arjuna Sahasrabahu. The ensuing battle between the two protagonists results in Rāwana’s defeat. From this account it is clear that were it not for the queen the narrative would not have progressed and the demon’s rampage have remained unchecked.

While the queen in the Arjunawijaya, like Sītā in the Rāmāyana, appears to be a strong narrative force, the Sutasoma narrative, which is Buddhist in nature, presents a different picture. At first glance, the hero Sutasoma’s consort Candrawati does not even appear to have any trait of narratological *sakti*. In the beginning of the narrative she is not wanted by Sutasoma at all, for he rejects his father’s suggestion that he marry any woman, although, as we shall see later, Candrawati would be chosen as the bride by his father because of her kin relation to him. Then, when Daśabahu, after being introduced to Sutasoma as his cousin by the sage Keśawa, makes an offer to
give his younger sister Candrawati as wife, Sutasoma initially declines the offer on the
ground that he is longing to return to the kingdom of Hastina to see his parents. It is
only after Daśabāhu’s skilful persuasion that Sutasoma accepts the offer. While
Sutasoma is indecisive, Candrawati, wanting to choose her husband by swayambara,
is unwilling to marry the man whom her brother chose without her knowledge, though
she finally accepts the arrangement. Then after the marriage, she has little to do with
the development of the story. The encounter of Sutasoma and the man-eater Poruśāda
comes about because of the demon’s need to capture one hundred kings for the
sacrifice. In fact, we are told of nothing about her once she is married to the hero. Her
only significant contribution to the development of the story is to produce Sutasoma’s
son Ardhana, thus ensuring the continuation of the dynasty after the return of
Sutasoma to the Buddha’s heaven. Although this is a prerequisite to conclude the
story, the role of Candrawati can be hardly compared with that of Sītā of the
Rāmāyaṇa, who at every stage of the story instigates its further development, or that
of Citrawati of the Arjunawijaya, who virtually prepares the way for the encounter of
Arjuna Sahasrabāhu and Rāwaṇa.

This episode is one of those which demonstrate Tantular’s considerable
skill of story-telling. Firstly, a demon, chased by Daśabāhu, approaches and asks
Sutasoma for asylum, as the latter just comes back with the sage Keśawa from
meditation at Mount Meru. Upon the demon’s repentance and promise to give up his
miscondut, Sutasoma grants him protection. Then Daśabāhu appears on the scene and,
witnessing Sutasoma waited upon by the demon, mistakes him for the king of demons
and challenges him. The ensuing fight is interrupted by Keśawa, who clarifies the real
identity of Sutasoma. Being informed that Sutasoma is his cousin, Daśabāhu offers his
sister Candrawati as wife to Sutasoma. When Sutasoma initially rejects his offer,
Daśabāhu threatens to kill the demon if the offer is not accepted, at the same time
agreeing that Sutasoma may return home immediately after the wedding and that
Daśabāhu will accompany him to serve the king of Hastina. Since Sutasoma has
already given up the life of the ascetic, he has no other choice but to accept the offer.
Each part of the episode is logically connected to the following one and all of the
characters are firmly interlocked in the story in a believable manner. This section has
no parallel in the Indian versions of the Sutasoma story.
The difference of the role of Candrawati in the Sutasoma and her counterparts in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Arjunawijaya may be accounted for by different religious ideologies on which the narratives are based. While the Hindu tradition assigns the static aspect to the male principle and the dynamic aspect to the female principle, Tantric Buddhism reverses their positions and assigns the dynamic aspect to the male principle and the static to the female (Bharati 1965: 200). In Hinduism, for example, the god Śiwa’s consort Pārvatī takes an active role in executing Śiwa’s function. Thus, “while Śiva remains more or less aloof in the creation of the world, Pārvatī as sakti is active, pervading the creation as its underlying strength and power” (Kinsley 1986: 49). On the other hand, in the Tantric Buddhist tradition the female principle is never called sakti despite an oft-found misnomer, but instead it is associated with prajñā (wisdom) and śūnya (void), notions which are invariably considered to be passive and static in Indian tradition, both Hindu and Buddhist. Thus, if the narratologically more active role of Citrawati in the Arjunawijaya narrative is due to the reflection in the narrative of the Hindu perception of the queen’s sakti, the apparently inactive role of Candrawati in the Sutasoma narrative may be explained by the nature of female principle in the Tantric Buddhist ideology.

However, the passivity of Candrawati in the narrative, as a consequence of the Tantric Buddhist ideology, does not mean that we should entirely dismiss her role as narratologically insignificant. In the very light of Tantric Buddhism she turns out to be indispensable in the makeup of the narrative. Originally she is seen by others, including Sutasoma himself, only as the princess Candrawati, the daughter of the king of Kāśi, suitable bride for the hero because of her kin relation to him. As Sutasoma and Candrawati enter the second maṇḍala, however, he is then able to perceive her as

---

9 Bharati takes pains to rectify the misuse of the term. According to him, “the Hindu pandit—regardless of his sectarian affiliations or sympathies—identifies ‘power’, ‘energy’, etc., with the feminine—sakti is a feminine noun—and sakti is the proper epithet of all Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain goddesses for him: he is not aware that the term sakti does not apply to Buddhist tantric female deities” (Bharati 1965: 201).
Wairocana's divine consort Locana. It is at this point that he actively pursues her and persuades her to join him in sexual union. He declares to her: "what I intended to obtain as my final goal in asceticism was you" (83.6). Then he tries to make her recall their real identity: "I was Wairocana and you Locana, the summit of beauty desired by the goddesses" (83.7). As the hero's coaxing intensifies, finally "the princess remembered their state, [that they were of] the same origin [namely] an excellent god and goddess" (84.1). Thus, Candrawati also motivates the hero in the Buddhist context. In other words, the significance of Cancrawati's role in the narrative originates not so much from what she does or desires, like Sita and Citrawati do, as from what she is, her identity as Locana in the ultimate truth of Tantric Buddhism. Furthermore, only through union with his consort can the hero Sutasoma attain the Buddhahood of the highest stage of Tantric Buddhism, and then set out for his new objective, the pacification of the demon king Porusāda.

**Kinship and Marriage Practice in Literature**

**Arjunawijaya**

The significance of the queen's role in the narrative is due not only to her *śakti*, both social and narratological, but also to her involvement in the marriage practices of royal families. Through marriage the king obtains his consort, and procreates his offspring. Then kingship, legitimized by the queen's *śakti*, is transferred through the line of descent. Moreover, marriage is also a basis of alliances between royal families. In other words, marriage practices are part of the process of the legitimization of kingship. What is interesting for us is that it is in this respect, as we shall see below, that the interplay between the literary horizon of expectation and the social practice is most intensified.

Firstly, we shall examine how marriage practices are described in Old Javanese literature. Again the comparison between the Arjunawijaya and the Sutasoma *kakawin* proves to be insightful. The Arjunawijaya in brief narrates the usurpation of kingdoms
by the ferocious Rāvana, who belongs to a demonic line of kings, and his subsequent defeat by Arjuna Sahasrabhāhu. Rāvana, together with his two brothers and one sister, are born, in the first place, as a result of contrivances of their demonic grandfather Sumāli, who, desirous of having offspring powerful enough to recover his lost kingdom, directs his daughter to have intercourse with the mighty sage Viśrava. The sage already has a son, who is called, in the narrative, by the patronymic Waiśrawana but is more commonly known elsewhere as Kuwera, the Lord of Wealth. It is Waiśrawana's splendid kingdom of Lēṅkā, ruled by demons until the god Viṣṇu got rid of them, that Rāvana is to recapture to fulfil his grandfather's wish.

As child of Viśrava, Rāvana is Waiśrawana's step brother, hence his power is potentially equal to that of Waiśrawana. Furthermore, through Viśrava's patrilineal lineage, as the son of the sage Pulastya and grandson of the god Brahmā, Rāvana himself is a grandson of Pulastya and a great-grandson of the god Brahmā. This genealogy enables Rāvana to be born powerful. Nevertheless, the genealogy alone does not ensure his becoming king. Rāvana and his brothers have to go through lengthy and severe ascetic practices before they are granted favours from the god Brahmā, favours which are indispensable to Rāvana's successful capture of Lēṅkā and other kingdoms. By these favours Rāvana is made invulnerable to attack from any being, is able to assume any form he wishes, is able to become invisible in battle, and is skilful in all the guiles of war. It is clear from the narrative that the kingly

---

10 The episode of the war between Rāvana and Waiśrawana is, as Worsley points out, a version of the motif of the conflict between two brothers over the throne. The motif was well known in ancient Javanese society in various versions, but the most well known version was the story of the war between the Pāṇḍava and Korawa in the Mahābhārata cycle. Apparently such a motif must have been appreciated in ancient Javanese society, where intrigue and conflict among royal family members over the throne was common (Worsley 1991: 168–71).
authority of Rāwaṇa is realized not so much by his genealogy as by the miraculous powers granted to him as the reward of penance.

In fact, it is remarkable that in the Arjunawijaya narrative that, apart from the brief description of the genesis of the demons, the description of kin relationships and marriage practices are mostly kept in the background. Rāwaṇa's marriage is not mentioned at all, although the existence of his wives and children are mentioned passingly in a single verse (69.3). So far as the other principle protagonist, the righteous king Arjuna Sahasrabahu, is concerned, only minimal attention is given to a description of his genealogy and succession to the throne. Only two stanzas (20.1–2) are used to make it known succinctly that the king is the ruler of Mahispati and the son of the king Kṛtawīrya. His queen Citrawati's descent is not mentioned at all.

This lack of attention to genealogical detail, however, should not be understood to mean that the poet discounted the matter entirely. Evidence suggests that the accounts of both Rāwaṇa and Arjuna Sahasrabahu in the Indian epic cycle was part of literary knowledge of the fourteenth century Majapahit society. As for Rāwaṇa, in the Uttarakāṇḍa Rāwaṇa's marriage to Mandroḍari and the birth of his children are recounted. Then one of the children, Meghanāda, captures the god Indra, giving himself the name Indrajit (Indra's victor). This episode is also narrated in the later kakawin Indrabhandana (Zoetmulder 1974: 85, 400–1). In the Rāmāyaṇa Indrajit also helps his father in the battle with Rāma's army, in which both Indrajit and Rāwaṇa are killed (Zoetmulder 1974: 222, 224). On the other hand, in the early thirteenth century kakawin Sumanasāntaka, a descendant of Arjuna Sahasrabahu, appears as one of the rivals of the prince Aja, grandfather of Rāma (Zoetmulder 1974: 302, 309). The death of Arjuna Sahasrabahu by Rāma Bhārgava (also known as Paraśurāma), briefly referred to in the Arjunawijaya itself,11 is recounted in a later kakawin called

---

11 In the Arjunawijaya, Arjuna Sahasrabahu prophesies that: "a priest who is an incarnation of Viṣṇu, and is famous for his courage [Rāma Bhārgava], will be the cause of my death" (72.1).
Rāmawijaya (Zoetmulder 1974: 402–4). Therefore it is possible to conclude that Tantular, knowing his readership well, elected to relegate these matter to the background of the narrative in order to focus on another way of legitimation.

Worsley has pointed out some aspects of the narrative which legitimatize the righteous king Arjuna Sahasrabahu’s royal authority (1991). The king’s legitimacy, as we have already discussed, relies primarily on his possession of and intimate relation with a queen, who releases his royal energy through sexual contact. The sexual dalliance of king and queen is elaborately depicted throughout the royal progress which proceeds in the splendid landscape of the realm. This is, however, not the only means of enhancing his kingship. The prosperity of the realm is further sustained by the king’s generosity towards his kinsmen and subjects. He demonstrates his generosity on the royal progress by holding a great feast with tributary kings, officials, soldiers and village people, and by giving gifts to the village chiefs and, last but definitely not least, the Śiwaite and Buddhist abbots.

The last point brings us to what appears to be regarded as a most important issue by the author, the endorsement of royal authority by priestly authority. On his royal progress the king Arjuna Sahasrabahu sojourns at a Śiwa-Buddhist complex, where the temple priest discourses on the ideal conduct of a king (26.4–30.4). He tells the king to perform the duty of liberality (*dana*), for great liberality is of the highest merit and a king who performs this duty attains the highest heaven. If a king fails to perform this obligation, the priest continues, the whole world will suffer. Then he proceeds to mention the royal duty of building new temple-complexes and maintaining existing ones. Obviously special importance is attached to this duty, for he warns that, if the king neglects or makes a mistake about this duty, not only the king himself will fall into distress but also the whole world will suffer, too. To this, the king obediently replies that: “I will perform the giving of alms (*andāna*),” and do my best to build

---

12 The text reads “*an dhana*”, but the editor of the text suggests “*an dāna*” (to practice liberality) (Supomo 1977: 310, note 31.4a).
religious and public buildings as well as to perform great sacrifices" (31.2–4). The king’s recognition of priestly authority is evident in the statement.

However, what is really meant by priestly authority becomes obvious only towards the end of the narrative when Rāwaṇa’s priestly grandfather Pulastya comes to the king Arjuna Sahasrabāhu. Pulastya asks the king to release and make peace with his captured grandson Rāwaṇa. Then, in his discourse to the king, Pulastya states that the goal of a priest’s ascetic practice and that of a king’s rule are the same, for, as Worsley points out, the royal authority of the king, who may be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu, can be legitimized only by the priest, who has the ability to invoke Viṣṇu to incarnate himself on earth as king (1991: 178). Thus, priestly authority is the real basis of the legitimacy of king. Considering the king’s own prophecy that he will be killed by the priestly incarnation of Viṣṇu, it is obvious that Tantular is hinting at the superiority of priestly authority over kingly authority.

Sutasoma

In contrast with the Arjunawijaya, in the Sutasoma narrative the endorsement of royal authority by priestly authority is not treated any more as the means of legitimization. This is not so much because priestly authority is now regarded as unimportant as because the hero, as the Buddha–King, has transcended the difference between the world renouncer and world maintainer. Instead, what is foregrounded are kin relationships and marriage practices, in the process of which obtaining a female consort and transferring the kingship along the proper line of descent is of paramount importance.

In the Sutasoma narrative we are repeatedly informed of Sutasoma’s genealogy (Figure 5.1). His patrilineal line is said to be descended from the Paṇḍava, who are in turn the descendants of the legendary patriarch Bharata.¹³ Thus, Sutasoma belongs

---

¹³ We have already discussed some problems associated with Sutasoma’s genealogy in chapter three.
Figure 5.1 Family Relationships in the Sutasoma Narrative
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to the most distinguished lineage in Old Javanese literature. However, to maintain itself, the lineage constantly needs female consorts who must be obtained through proper marriage practices. It is in the context of Sutasoma’s marital relationship that his consort Candrawati emerges as an important player in the story, quite contrary to her subdued function as royal or narratological sakti. The importance attached to her is not merely incidental to the process of story-telling, for the occasions on which her lineage is disclosed are clearly marked in the narrative. The information about her lineage is communicated not directly by the author-narrator from outside the story but by one of the knowledgeable characters within the story. The first occasion on which this happens is when the Buddhist sage Sumitra reveals his relationship with Sutasoma, who soujourns at former’s hermitage on the way to Mount Meru. He calls Sutasoma his grandson and explains why:

19.1 In olden times Śrī Rawibhoja / had two sons, the elder was king Subala, / the younger was Jayatsena, myself [Sumitra], / who from childhood had the conduct and marks of a sage.

19.2 After my childhood I went and stayed in the forest as a Buddhist monk. / My brother became king after the death of my father, / and had two children, a girl and a boy; / the elder and excellent hero, was called Candrasingha.

19.3 The younger—a very beautiful girl—was called Prajñādhārī, / who was married to the king of Hastina. She is your mother, no other. / King Candrasingha ruled over the kingdom.

19.4 After his death in his palace / by sickness, caused by poison of an evil man, / his son became king, / known throughout the world as king Daśabāhu, the supernaturally powerful one.

19.5 Daśabāhu has a younger sister, / a beautiful princess, whose name is Candrawati. / She is perfect match for you and will be devoted to you in the bridal chamber, / because she is your younger cousin, not a distant relative.
The relationship between Candrawati and Sutasoma is clearly explained in this discourse. Sutasoma's mother and Candrawati's father are sister and brother. In other words, Candrawati is Sutasoma's matrilateral cross-cousin.14

The practice of marriage between cousins is intentional. Initially Candrawati, offended by the idea of having her marriage arranged by someone else without her knowledge, strongly refuses to accept Sutasoma as her prospective husband, when she is informed of her brother Daśabāhu's marriage arrangement. She favours the ceremony of swayambara (bride's choice of a husband) and makes her point by referring to the story of the princess Indumati, whose brother the king Bhoja held a swayambara for her.15 Surāga, the aged and wise lady-in-waiting, coaxes her into accepting the marriage arrangement by pointing out that it is her late father's wish to

---

14 A pair of cousins are called “cross-cousins” if the mother of one of them and the father of the other are sister and brother (siblings of different sexes). On the other hand, a pair of cousins are called “parallel cousins”, either, if their fathers are brothers or if their mothers are sisters (siblings of the same sex). See Fox (1967: 185). “Matrilateral” refers to the relatives of a person's mother's side. This reference depends on the viewpoint from which relatives are seen. For example, Candrawati is Sutasoma's matrilateral cousin, but for her Sutasoma is patrilateral cousin (cousin on her father's side). Soewito-Santoso thinks wrongly that the “father” in verse 71.3 (“He [=Sutasoma] is the first cousin on my dearest's [=Candrawati] father's side” (sireki sānak amisan saka ri yayah ri māsku)) is a mistake and reads it as “mother”, but the original text is correct, for the statement is made by Daśabāhu, thus from Candrawati's side.

15 The reference is to the kakawin Sumanasāntaka composed by the poet Monaguna in the early thirteenth century (Zoetmulder 1974: 298–311). The princess Indumati chooses the prince Aja from the kingdom of Ayodhya, who is to be the grandfather of Rāma. Thus the story narratively precedes the story of Rāmāyaṇa. Interestingly in the story the princess Indumati is embarrassed by the fact that her brother is holding a swayambara instead of “the usual procedure, waiting for someone to approach him with a request for the hand of his sister” (Zoetmulder 1974: 301). This part of the story is conveniently ignored by Tantular, for his intention is to present swayambara as an feasible alterantive, at least from Candrawati's point of view, to Daśabāhu's arranged marriage.
have the prince of Hastina as her husband and that her brother is obliged to carry out the wish (64.3).

The marriage of Sutasoma and Candrawati results in the birth of a son, Ardhana, the crown prince, who completes a series of kings who succeeded the throne of Hastina along the patrilineal line from Sutasoma’s father Mahāketu to Sutasoma and then to his son Ardhana. On the other hand, the patrilineal line of Candrawati’s descent traces the succession to the throne of the kingdom of Kāśi. According to the sage Sumitra’s account, the king, Śrī Rawibhoja, had two sons. The elder son Subala succeeded him after his death, while the younger one, Sumitra himself, became a Buddhist monk. Then the king Subala had a son Candrasingha and a daughter Prajñādhari, and was succeeded by the son upon his death. It is the king Candrasingha who is the father of Daśabāhu and Candrawati. When the king was murdered, Daśabāhu became the king of Kāśi.

Between the two dynasties of Kāśi and Hastina, there are two occasions when marriages take place. Firstly, king Subala’s daughter Prajñādhari was married off to the king Mahāketu. Secondly the king Candrasingha’s daughter Candrawati is married off to the prince Sutasoma. What is really happening here is that the Kāśi kings are providing the Hastina kings with their daughters as wives. The matrilateral (from the Hastina’s point of view) cross-cousin marriage is simply a result of this marital maneuver.

The same pattern recurs in the episode concerning the succession and marriage of Daśabāhu. When Daśabāhu and Sutasoma are travelling to the kingdom of Kāśi, they pass the kingdom of Awangga, which has been completely ruined and deserted. Daśabāhu tells Sutasoma that it is he who destroyed the kingdom, when he fought against and subsequently defeated Dewāntaka, the king of Awangga, and his brother Kośa, the king of Magadha. He then explains why the war broke out:

57.15 ... Formerly [they were] regarded as very intimate friends and not as strangers. / The reason of the dispute is a beautiful girl, [namely] the daughter of the king of Mālawa, / called Puspawati,
one of my [Daśabāhu] cousins on my mother's side, but her father—so it is said—had decided she should only marry a close relative.

57.16 Sang Kośa was ill and baffled, distressed by lovesickness for the beautiful princess, and so he asked the king of Mālawa for her hand, but the king became enraged, as he [Kośa] was no relative. This was why he [the king of Mālawa] came to me, and married her to me, the rite being perfectly performed. He spoke again and again of the [importance of] a common origin and his attempts to get a son-in-law who was one of his relatives.

Feeling sorry about his brother's unsuccessful proposal, Dewāntaka then came to Daśabāhu for his sister Candrawati's hand as a substitute for Puspawati. But the proposal was again rejected, for Daśabāhu already had Sutasoma in mind as the prospective bridegroom. The shame of being rejected twice made Dewāntaka and Kośa wage a war against Daśabāhu, who killed them in his ten-armed form.

It is evident from the account, and the king of Mālawa made it explicit, that Daśabāhu's wife, the daughter of the Mālawa king, is his cousin on his mother's side. This means that his mother also came from the royal family of Mālawa. Considering the case in Kāśi and Hastina, we may safely presume that the succession the Mālawa throne also proceeds along the patrilateral line. Then, the Mālawa king and Daśabāhu's mother are brother and sister, being children of the previous Mālawa king. Hence Daśabāhu's wife is his matrilateral cross-cousin. The pattern repeats itself. The Mālawa kings supply the Kāśi kings with their daughters as wives. In their return, the Kāśi kings provide the Hastina kings with their daughters as wives.16

16 This kind of marriage pattern has been known by anthropologists as "asymmetrical", because in this system women are always given from one group to another and never the other way around. In the real world the circulation of women makes a loop so that the women cycle around, say, the three groups like A→B→C→A..., thus the women given and taken being balanced. It has been also known that this system results in matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (Fox 1967: 208–10).
The political implication of this marriage pattern is important. In brief, it forms a political alliance between the "wife-giving" group and "wife-taking" group, in which the former pledges allegiance to the latter while the latter extends patronage to the former. Throughout the account described above, Daśabāhu continuously displays strong allegiance to the kings of Hastina. Even before he meets Sutasoma, he has served Sutasoma's father, the king Mahāketu. The sage Sumitra talks to Sutasoma about Daśabāhu's service to the king:

20.9 Moreover he [Daśabāhu] was very devoted to the king of Hastina [Mahāketu], / and your father appointed him always to be lord / and master of the lesser kings / and to annihilate all demons who are even now on the rampage throughout the forest.

The alliance between the king of Kāśi and Hastina must have been bolstered by the marital relationship between the two dynasties. Since the king Mahāketu's wife is the daughter of the king Subala and her brother is Daśabāhu's father, Mahāketu is Daśabāhu's uncle-in-law. This relationship places the obligation on Daśabāhu to serve the ruler of Hastina, while, in turn, the Hastina king grants him a privileged position over other lesser kings. The alliance which emerges as a result of the marital relationship, is aimed at maintaining order in the society. Later in the story, the lady-in-waiting Surāga explains Daśabāhu's obligation to Candrawati and Sutasoma:

64.4 Moreover he [Daśabāhu] had made a pledge, repeatedly discussed with the queen. / In former times it never happened that an older king became subject of his younger sister, / but he will devote himself to you [Candrawati] after your wedding with the prince [Sutasoma], / for then the prince will be made king in the palace to succeed him as a Universal Monarch [dewa ning jagat].

64.5 Your brother [Daśabāhu] will be only [an officer] of the army to guard the country, / [he] will join the kings to become a loyal attendant. / . . .
Surâga’s statement anticipates the development of the story, for, like the sage Sumitra, she is one of those knowledgeable characters in the narrative. When Sutasoma returns to Hastina with his bride Candrawati, Daśabâhu accompanies them and decides not to return to his own country but to stay in Hastina as the commander of the palace guard (92.4). This indicates his total allegiance to the Hastina king and the abandonment of his sovereignty over the kingdom of Kāśī. His move is followed by many other kings, who acknowledge Sutasoma’s supreme sovereignty by submitting their daughters to Sutasoma to be his wives (92.3). Thus, it is evident that in the Sutasoma narrative the “wife-taking” group is considered to be superior to the “wife-giving” group.¹⁷

We have seen that in the Sutasoma narrative the kin relationships of the king is a key to his legitimacy. It involves two principle aspects of kinship system. One is the principle of descent (consanguinity) that organizes a group of people “vertically” along a blood line or lineage originating from their apical ancestor. The principle plays a vital role in governing the inheritance of property or succession to office. The other is the principle of marriage (affinity) that establishes “horizontal” links between descent groups through the exchange of their female members. Marriage enables a descent group to be allied with other descent groups and thus affords the group an ability to mobilize groups beyond itself. In the Sutasoma narrative relations of consanguinity are strictly organized along the patrilateral line, as we have seen in the pattern of succession to the throne. The relations of affinity on the other hand are realized as matrilateral cross-cousin marriages, by which a superior–inferior relationship is established between the “wife-taking” group and the “wife-giving” group, exchanging

¹⁷ A similar attitude is to be observed, for instance, in the Kidung Sunda. In this Kidung the Sundanese king is ordered to give up his princess as a gift and token of submission to the Majapahit king. The Sundanese king’s rejection not to the marriage proposal itself but to the acknowledgement of the Majapahit’s superiority leads to a tragic battle between the two kingdoms (Zoetmulder 1974: 423–6). See also Weatherbee (1968).
allegiance and patronage between them. The strength of alliance through marriage is best demonstrated in the mobilization of the army led by Daśabāhu in the fight against the demons.

Mahābhārata Cycle

The marriage practices we have seen above are, in fact, not unique to the Sutasoma narrative but also found in the Mahābhārata cycle. Thus, we may assume that the pattern is one of the elements in the Old Javanese literary tradition which were inherited from Indian literary tradition. Now, the genealogical focus of the constellation of characters in the Mahābhārata, who are intricately related through descent and marriage, is Arjuna, third of the five Pāṇḍava brothers, for it is from his son Abhimanyu that the generations of Hastina kings are descended.

According to the Mahābhārata, Arjuna marries Kṛṣṇa's sister Subhadrā, while he is in exile for twelve years. Since Kṛṣṇa's father Basudewa is the brother of Arjuna's mother Kuntī, Subhadrā is Arjuna's matrilateral cross-cousin. It is noteworthy that the elopement of Arjuna and Subhadrā is suggested by the bride's brother Kṛṣṇa despite the fact that Kṛṣṇa's brother Balarāma has intended to marry her off to Duryodana, the eldest of the Korawa brothers. A consequence of the marriage appears to be a strengthening of the relationship between Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa, one which proves advantageous to Arjuna. In the war between the Pāṇḍava and

---

18 This exile is a solitary one which is caused by Arjuna’s breach of an agreement covering his relationship with Dropadi, and precedes another twelve-year exile of the Pāṇḍava brothers. In Old Javanese literature the episodes of Arjuna’s elopement with Subhadrā at Kṛṣṇa’s suggestion, and the subsequent marriage is briefly narrated in the Ādiparwa (Zoetmulder 1974: 71). A more elaborate version is found in a later kakawin called Subhadrāwiwāha (Zoetmulder 1974: 383-4).
Korawa, although asked for help by the both clans, Krṣṇa decides to serve Arjuna personally as his charioteer, contributing to the victory of the Pāṇḍava side.\(^\text{19}\)

Furthermore, the same marriage pattern is repeated between the children of Arjuna and Krṣṇa in the *kakawin* Ghaṭotkacāśraya, composed in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. While the Pāṇḍava are in their twelve-year exile, Abhimanyu, the son of Arjuna and Subhadra, becomes enamoured of Krṣṇa’s daughter Kṣiti Sundari. After a series of events they are permitted by Krṣṇa to marry, and later have the son Parikṣit. Again the bride is the bridegroom’s matrilateral cross-cousin.

It should be now clear that in the Old Javanese literary tradition the Yadu, Krṣṇa’s lineage, is the “wife-giving” group and the Pāṇḍava, Arjuna’s lineage, is the “wife-taking” group. Firstly, Śūra, Basudeva’s father, gives his daughter Kunti to Pāṇḍu. Then Basudeva’s daughter Subhadra is taken by Pāṇḍu’s son Arjuna on her her brother’s suggestion. Finally, Basudeva’s son Krṣṇa marries off his daughter Kṣiti Sundari to Arjuna’s son Abhimanyu. The last two cases result in matrilateral cross-cousin marriages in the Pāṇḍava line. In this set of relationships we observe, on the one hand, that Pāṇḍava kingship is transferred along the patrilineal line of the Pāṇḍava lineage, from Yudhiṣṭhira, the eldest of the Pāṇḍava brothers, to Parikṣit, Arjuna’s grandson, whose descendants include Sutasoma, are the kings of Hastina kingdom. On the other hand, the Pāṇḍava lineage is greatly assisted by the Yadu, as exemplified by Krṣṇa’s assistance of Arjuna, on the basis of the alliance formed through the matrilateral cross-cousin marriages.

In this connection it is interesting to note that although in the Ghaṭotkacāśraya *kakawin* the episode of Abhimanyu’s marriage with Kṣiti Sundari is presented in the

\(^{19}\) The image of Arjuna and his dedicated charioteer Krṣṇa is evoked in the Sutasoma narrative when people see Daśabāhu drive a chariot as charioteer for Sutasoma (57.10). The implication of the parallelism between these two alliances is obvious.
setting of the Mahābhārata story, that is, in a part of the Wirataparwa which deals with the period of the Pāṇḍava’s exile, the character Kṣiti Sundari is completely unknown in the Indian epic literature. If this episode is a Javanese invention, as it appears to be, its creation indicates that by the beginning of the thirteenth century the practice of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage had been truly established as part of the horizon of expectation of kakawin literature.

Kidung Literature

To round out our discussion on the marriage practices in Old Javanese literature, we shall touch on the pattern in another major genre, kidung literature, before turning to the practice in the society. As discussed in chapter two, kidung literature represents a new literary horizon of expectation, which is quite different from that of kakawin literature in various aspects. This is also true of the representation of the marriage practices. It is hoped then that the contrast of these practices in kidung and kakawin literature will further illuminate the nature of the two literary horizons. In this section two kidung narratives are primarily examined as examples of two different kinds of kidung literature. The first one, the Sri Tañjung, is directly related to the story world of the Mahābhārata cycle, whereas the other, the Malat, a courtly romance, represents a more indigenous kind of story world.

Besides being preserved in codices, the story of the kidung Sri Tañjung is represented on reliefs of Canḍi Surawana located to the northeast of Kediri in eastern Java. The canḍi has been identified as the temple Śūrabhāṇa in the Nāgarakṛtāgama (62.2, 82.2), a temple visited by Rājasanagara during his royal progress in 1361.

---


21 For further information on Canḍi Surawana, see Krom (1923: vol. 2, 209–261) and Bernet Kempers (1959: 96). It is also noteworthy that the reliefs of Canḍi Surawana illustrate the exemplary kakawin story of Arjunawiwāha, juxtaposed
Thus, it can be safely assumed that the story is contemporary with the author of the Sutasoma *kakawin*. Yet, despite their proximity, the marriage pattern described in the *kidung* is remarkably different from that in the *kakawin*. The Sri Taňjung story recounts a genealogy which is of purely Javanese invention but is conceptually related to the Mahābhārata cycle, for it involves the children of Sahadewa (Sadewa in the *kidung*) and Nakula (Sakula in the *kidung*), the youngest twin brothers of the Pāṇḍava (Zoetmulder 1974: 435–6). The heroine Sri Taňjung is the daughter of Sadewa and his wife Padapa, whereas her husband Sidapaksa is the son of Sakula and his wife Soka. As is described in another *kidung* Sudamala, to which the Sri Taňjung is a sequel, Padapa and Soka are sisters (Zoetmulder 1974: 433–4). This puts the wife and husband in a completely symmetrical kin relationship; that is, from Sidapaksa’s viewpoint Sri Taňjung is his father’s brother’s daughter as well as his mother’s sister’s daughter. At the same time from Sri Taňjung’s viewpoint Sidapaksa is her father’s brother’s son as well as her mother’s sister’s son. In other words, they are both patrilateral parallel and matrilateral parallel-cousins.

Despite the fact that its story world is directly connected to the Mahābhārata cycle and that its origin was contemporary with *kakawin* works, the marriage practices of the Sri Taňjung indicates that the *kidung* represents a new horizon of expectation in this respect as well. The practice of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage is abandoned, and instead the practice of parallel-cousin marriage is observed. The transmission of kingship along the patrilineal line is also not absent in the *kidung* narrative, but this may be due to the fact that in the Mahābhārata cycle only Arjuna’s descendants inherit the kingship of Hastina kingdom, whereas Sahadewa (Sadewa) and Nakula (Sakula) are only junior members of the Pāṇḍava. The shift from cross-cousin marriage to parallel-cousin marriage is more evident and elaborate in the courtly romance, in which the story is set in the world of Javanese courts. In the courtly romance the complexity

with the Sri Taňjung story. This appears to indicate that the *kidung* story was received as favourably as the *kakawin* by the contemporary audience. See also Worsley (1986).
of marriage practice is so bewildering that it even seems to overshadow the
development of the plot. Here we shall take the Malat as an example of a courtly
romance (Vickers 1986).

The core of the Malat story involves a confrontation between two kin groups
over the winning wives. The first group consists of the families of kings of Kauripan,
Daa and Gegelang, who are brothers, and the king of Singasari, their brother-in-law.
The second group consists of the families of the kings of Lasem, Mataram and
Mataun, who are also brothers, and their brothers-in-law. One day the princess of
Daa, Rangkesari, is lost and then found by the king of Mataun, who, being childless,
adopts her as daughter. The king of Lasem marries her, but she refuses to sleep with
him. Then the king of Mataram asks the hand of the princess of Gegelang,
Ratnaningrat, but the proposal is rejected. Consequently the kings of Lasem and
Mataram, with their brothers-in-law, wage war against Gegelang. Meanwhile, the
prince of Kauripan, Nusapati, who is later called Pañji and to whom Rangkesari has
been betrothed, and Rangkesari’s brother, Wiranantaja, set out to search for the lost
princess, but both fail. Pañji eventually settles down in Gegelang, having collected
several wives, including the princess of Singasari, through a series of events.
Wiranantaja, too, having become the king of Malaya and married there, return to
Gegelang. When the enemy kings attack Gegelang, Pañji and Wiranantaja fight
together and kill them. Wiranantaja discovers his lost sister and takes her back to his
palace under a false identity. Later Pañji and Wiranantaja fall in love with Rangkesari
and Ratnaningrat respectively, and eventually abduct them. But in the end they are all
reconciled and the whole kin group celebrates the reunion after the revelation of their
true identities.

From this synopsis a particular marriage practice emerges. Besides a number of
secondary wives, the two main characters, Pañji and Wiranantaja, marry their
patrilateral parallel-cousins (father’s brother’s daughter), Rangkesari and Ratnaningrat.
In other words, the royal house of Kauripan takes a wife from Daa (Pañji takes
Rangkesari), and the latter in turn takes one from Gegelang (Wiranantaja takes
Ratnaningrat). Even though these marriages are initiated by the men’s abduction of the women, which at first upsets the women’s parents, the marriages are eventually acknowledged and blessed by the parents of the both sides. Considering the pattern in the Sri Tañjung, patrilateral parallel-cousin marriage appears to be the most favoured marriage pattern in kidung literature. Nevertheless, there exists another pattern in the Malat narrative. Before marrying Rangkesari, Pañji has abducted and married the princess of Singasari, who is most likely his patrilateral cross-cousin (father’s sister’s daughter), for the king of Singasari is probably married to Pañji’s father’s sister. In any case, the marriage not only consolidates the alliance between the three kin groups, Kauripan, Daa and Gegelang, but also enables them to mobilize people, in this case Singasari, beyond the primary kin group. The enemy kings are also allied on the basis of kinship and marriage. In the first place they are all either brothers or brothers-in-law. It also appears that the princess of Mataram is given to the king of Lasem in principle because the kings of Mataram and Lasem are brothers. This indicates that the giving and taking of wives between the kin groups is also common among the enemy kings. It seems, however, their defeat in the end is a consequence of their failure to carry out the practice properly. The princess of Mataun is in reality not the daughter of the king of Mataun, but the princess of Daa, Rangkesari, in a false identity. And the proposal of the king of Mataram to the princess of Gegelang, who is not related to him, turns out be a fatal mistake for him and his kin. In this context, it is appropriate to remind ourselves of the episode of Dašabāhu’s marriage in the Sutasoma kakawin, in which Dašabāhu forcefully rejects the proposal to his sister from an unrelated king. Although the marriage pattern is different, the principle operating behind it is the same. The marriage is the real basis of the political and military alliance. Thus, one is allowed to marry only according to a prescribed pattern. Whoever fails to observe this pattern is destined for defeat, for he is incapable of forming a successful alliance and procreating a proper dynastic successor.
**Kinship and Marriage as Social Practice**

**Kinship Terminology**

Having considered the kinship system and marriage pattern as represented in literature, now we shift our attention to the pattern as practised in society. Before analyzing specifically the practice in the Majapahit royal family at the time of the composition of the Sutasoma *kakawin*, however, we shall first consider Fox’s analysis of the kinship terminology in ancient Javanese society in order to gain a broader perspective (Fox 1986). His method, an anthropological approach to the past, is built on an implicit assumption that the particular setting of terminology of the language corresponds with the social reality. Although the assumption needs to be handled carefully, combined with the comparison of Modern Javanese kinship terminology, Fox’s analysis provides us with a reasonably reliable foundation for an understanding of kinship categories as perceived by ancient Javanese.

The most interesting finding of his analysis, and one which he sees as characteristically Austronesian, is the fact that in Old Javanese gender plays a smaller role in the definition of kinship terms, while generations are clearly distinguished to a considerable depth in both descending and ascending generations. Terms in descending generations are purely generational, although the sex of one’s children and grandchildren may be distinguished by modifiers for “male” and “female”. On the other hand, while one’s parents and grandparents are marked by both generational difference and sex, one’s great-grandparents are not any more distinguished by sex. In

---

22 An interesting example is the curious absence of an indigenous specific term for “daughter” in Old Javanese. Needless to say, the absence of the word does not entail that the notion of daughter was absent from the society, for it could be readily conveyed by a combination of elemental terms.
other words, in the Old Javanese kinship system ancestors as well as descendants "beyond the second generation are categorically genderless" (Fox 1986: 324).

This is all the more significant since ancient Javanese society knew the quintessentially patrilineal term *pitr* (forefathers), borrowed from Sanskrit, and performed the Indian ancestral rites of *srāddha* in honour of them (Zoetmulder 1982: 1372). Despite the adoption of this patrilineal Indian practice, however, the terminology of the old Javanese kinship system patently lacks specific terms to trace one's descent exclusively along the male line, because it is a bilateral descent system in which one's lineage is traced through both male and female lines. Fox asserts that this fact accounts for the pattern of the dynastic succession of ancient Javanese kingdoms, in which the gender of an dynastic ancestor would simply become irrelevant after two generations, though his or her generational depth is well acknowledged. He concludes that:

It is perhaps possible to argue that were a dynasty to be perpetuated, at some point through a female ancestor, this factor is only relevant for the immediate generations. This would seem to place a two- or, at most, three-generation limit on disputes over dynastic succession involving male or female lines. Thereafter, the gender of lines would become irrelevant. (Fox 1986: 324)

Therefore, in terms of dynastic succession, the bilateral descent system enables ancient Javanese society to have both "considerable flexibility in descent reckoning, through either male or female lines" and "long legitimizing dynastic genealogies" (Fox 1986: 325).

The kinship terms used in the Sutasoma *kakawin* fit nicely into the system of the kinship terminology Fox has reconstructed. This is in a sense natural since the language of *kakawin* is evidently a subset of Old Javanese. We only need a glance at some examples to confirm this. In the narrative the marital relations involve the main characters from three patrilineal lineages: Sutasoma from Hastina, Daśabahu and Candrawati from Kaśi, and Puspawati from Mālawā. The protagonist Sutasoma is
referred by Daśabāhu as Candrawati’s first cousin on her father’s side (sānak amisan saka ri yayah i māsuk) (71.3) and is referred by the narrator as sibling-in-law (ipe) of Daśabāhu (57.21). Although Fox specifies the meaning of ipe as spouse’s sibling (1986: 319), it is clear from the use in the Sutasoma (57.21) that ipe also means sibling’s spouse, since Daśabāhu should see Sutasoma as his sister’s husband.23 Candrawati, in turn, is called Sutasoma’s first cousin (sānak, amisan) (19.5, 57.5). Daśabāhu and Candrawati themselves are described as elder sibling (rāka) (64.5) and younger sibling (antēn, rari, yayi) (19.5, 64.4, 71.2). Although Fox’s list (1986: 318) does not include rari and yayi, the terms without doubt mean “younger sibling” (Zoetmulder 1982: 1514, 2363). Finally, Daśabāhu’s wife Puspawati is referred by him as a cousin on his mother’s side (amisan sangkeng ibu mwang nghulun) (57.15). Thus, the use of the kinship terms in the kakawin not only confirms but also supplements Fox’s account (1986: 318–19).

However, what is significant about the analysis of Old Javanese kinship terminology is that it suggests a discrepancy between the Sutasoma narrative and society in regard to marriage practices. Firstly, while the narrative stipulates the succession of kingship along the patrilateral line of descent, kinship terminology based on bilateral descent opens the possibility of the succession of kingship through both male and female lines. Secondly, while the narrative displays a strong preference for matrilateral cross-cousin marriage, the kinship terminology does not indicate the same tendency, although again we must be warned that the lack of a term does not mean the absence of the notion or practice from the society, for it can be readily expressed by the combination of existing terms as in Puspawati’s case.

23 From this it can be also inferred that paripeyan, a derivative of ipe, means not only spouse’s sibling’s spouse, as Fox specifies (1986: 319), but also sibling’s spouse’s sibling as well. This definition corresponds with the use of Modern Javanese equivalent ipe and pripean (Koentjaraningrat 1985: 270).
Kinship and Marriage Practice in the Majapahit Kingdom

As a court literature, *kakawin* works as a rule were primarily aimed at a court audience and often explicitly associated with certain royal members. Tantular's two works are no exception. In both works two contemporary royal members of the Majapahit kingdom are named, of whom Supomo has made a detailed study (1977: 3–15). Firstly, as mentioned in the last chapter, the king Rājasanagara (also known as Hayam Wuruk), who reigned from 1350 until his death in 1389, is referred to as the future Lord Girinātha of Java in the gods' eulogy for Sutasoma in the *kakawin* Sutasoma (53.3–4). In addition to this, he is also referred to and his welfare is prayed for in the epilogues of the Sutasoma *kakawin* as the king Rājasa (148.3), and in the prologue of the Arjunawijaya as Pamēkas-ing-Tuṣṭa (1.2) and Wēkas-ning-Sukha (1.4). The reference to Rājasanagara as the contemporary king also indicates that the Sutasoma *kakawin* must have been composed before 1389, the year of the king's death. Another royal personage, with whom the two *kakawin* are closely associated, is the author Tantular's patron Raṇamanggala. While in the epilogue of the Sutasoma he is thanked by the author for his encouragement (148.4), in the prologue of the Arjunawijaya information about his relationship with the king is provided. Thus we know that he was the son of the brother (*bhrātrārmaja*) of the king Rājasanagara and also the son-in-law (*mantu*) of the king. The former information refers to Raṇamanggala's status as the son of the step-brother of the king, whereas the latter refers to his status as the husband of the younger sister (Rājasawardhani) of the king. Furthermore, the reference to Raṇamanggala's marriage to Rājasawardhani enables us to establish that the Arjunawijaya must have been written after 1364, the year of the completion of the Nāgarakṛtāgama, for in the latter text Rājasawardhani is described as unmarried. With this data as well as other and the reasonable assumption that the Arjunawijaya was composed earlier than the Sutasoma, Supomo has come to the conclusion that the Arjunawijaya *kakawin* may have been composed between 1374 and 1379, and the Sutasoma between 1379 and 1385 (1977: 14–15).
Although, as Supomo himself admits, this chronology is far from definite, its time frame is still close enough for our purpose to situate the two *kakawin* works in the socio-historical context in which they were produced. The time frame we are looking at is then a rather peculiar period in the Majapahit era, one which saw the prosperous reign of king Rājasanagara and one punctuated at both ends by the two major historical events, the death of the militant prime minister Gajah Mada in 1364, a year before the completion of the Nāgarakṛtāgama, and the death of the king himself in 1389. It is the royal court during this period that Tantular must have considered as his audience, and hence we shall now examine marriage practice in this period. For the sake of argument, however, instead of tracing the change which took place during the period, we shall take the year 1385 as a sort of the cross-section in the flow of time, for it appears to be reasonably close to the actual year of the composition of the Sutasoma *kakawin*.

When Tantular composed the Sutasoma *kakawin* in this year 1385, about a decade had lapsed since he wrote the Arjunawijaya *kakawin*. At the time major players in the Majapahit royal scene clustered around the king, his younger sister and their children.24 Their relationships are diagrammed in Figure 5.2. Firstly, the king Rājasanagara, the fourth monarch of Majapahit, who in 1350 succeeded his mother Tribhuwana, the third monarch, was fifty-five years old at the time, with only five years left before his death in 1389. He was married to Sudewi, a daughter of Wijayarājasa, who was Tribhuwanā’s younger sister’s husband. Wijayarājasa, also known as Bhre Wēngkēr, had considerable influence on court politics, as father-in-law of the king and because of his marriage with Rājadewi, the former monarch Tribhuwanā’s younger sister. However, his daughter Sudewi, who married Rājasanagara, was born not from his first wife Rājadewi but from a concubine, who

---

24 In the following the identification and the estimation of the age of the royal members are based on Noorduyn (1978) and Schrieke (1957). For further information about the Majapahit dynasty, see Krom (1931) and Weatherbee (1968).
Figure 5.2 Family Relationships of the Majapahit Dynasty in the Late Fourteenth Century
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was unrelated to Tribhuwanā. Wijayarājasa’s other daughter Indudewi, born from Rājadewi, was instead married to Rājasawardhana. Therefore, Rājasanagara and Sudewi were not directly related. Nevertheless she might have been regarded as Rājasanagara’s matrilateral parallel cousin (mother’s sister’s daughter), if we accept that children from concubines were officially recognized as those from the first wife, although their status may not have been equal to children from the first wife. This conjecture is not groundless. In the Arjunawijaya (1.4) Raṇamanggala is called Rājasanagara’s brother’s son (brātṛatmaja), thus clearly indicating that although Raṇamanggala’s father Soṭor was a concubine’s son, he was regarded as Rājasanagara’s, and consequently, Iśvari’s brother. Futhermore, Jayanagara, who later became the second monarch, is known to be the son from the first wife of the first monarch Kṛtarājasa, although according to other sources he is said to be born from Kṛtarājasa’s concubine from Mēlayu (Krom 1931). Then, it might have been the case that in the Majapahit kingdom the father determined the status of the child.25 From Sudewi, Rājasanagara had a daughter Kusumawardhanī, and a son Wirabhūmi from a concubine. Again, it must be noted, if our conjecture above is right, Wirabhūmi may have been regarded as Kusumawardhanī’s sister.

Secondly, Rājasangara’s younger full-sister Iśvari had three children:

1) The first was Nāgarawardhanī, the elder daughter, who was then around thirty-three years old. She was married to Wirabhūmi, Rājasanagara’s son by a concubine. Wirabhūmi must have been around the same age as his wife. It is clear the Nāgarawardhanī was Wirabhūmi’s patrilateral cross-cousin (father’s sister’s daughter). Interestingly Wirabhūmi was at some point adopted by the childless Indudewi, Wijayarājasa’s daughter by Rājadewi. The move certainly must have

25 The practice of regarding certain kinsmen or kinswomen as one’s cousins not because they are biologically cousins but because they are “classified” into cousins is not an unusual phenomenon in the world. This kind of term has been referred to by anthropologists as “classificatory” (Fox 1967: 187).
brought him closer to Wijayarājasa (Noorduyn 1975). According to the Pararaton, he had four children, although not necessarily by Nāgarawardhani (Schrieke 1957: 42–3). Among the four, the second child, the eldest daughter called Bhre Matarām, was married to Wikramawardhana, the son of Iśwari. The third child, the youngest daughter, called Bhre Lasēm, was married to Wikramawardhana’s son Bhre Tumapēl.

2) The second child of Iśwari was the son Wikramawardhana, who was around thirty-two years old at the time. Apart from his liaisons with concubines, he was married to the crown princess Kusumawardhani, Rājasanagara’s daughter by his first wife Sudewi, and by virtue of this marriage succeeded to the throne as the fifth monarch of Majapahit kingdom. It must be also noted that Kusumawardhani was Wikramawardhana’s matrilateral cross-cousin (mother’s brother’s daughter) and, as we discussed before, may have been regarded as Wirabhūmi’s sister. Wikramawardhana had a son from Kusumawardhani and three other children by several concubines: a) The crown prince Hyang Wēkasing-Suka was the only child from the first wife Kusumawardhani. He may have been around ten years old at the time and died in 1399 without issue, which appears to have been one of the causes which lead to the civil war of 1405–6. b) Another son was called Bhre Tumapēl and was the same age as or younger than the crown prince. c) The daughter Suhita, who later succeeded to the throne in 1429 as the sixth monarch of the kingdom, must have been not more than eleven years old and was probably no more than a new-born infant in 1385. d) The son Kṛtawijaya, also called Bhre Tumapēl, must have been not more than ten years old and was probably a new-born baby at the time.

3) Finally, the third child of Iśwari was Rājasawrādhanī, the younger daughter, who was about thirty years old in 1385. She was married to Raṇamanggalī, whose father was Soṭor, a son of the second monarch Kṛtawijaya by a concubine. Although Soṭor was a concubine’s son, if our argument about Sudewi is correct, Rājasawrādhanī might have been regarded as Raṇamanggalī’s patrilateral cross-cousin (father’s sister’s daughter). It must be also noted that, when Wikramawardhana succeeded to the throne in 1389, Raṇamanggalī would have become, along with
Wirabhumi, one of the two men who were married to their new king’s sisters, a status which must have added to their importance in the court politics. Then, when Raṇamanggala patronized Tantular in his composing the *kakawin* works, Tantular, in all probability, took into consideration the marriage pattern of the Majapahit dynasty in general and his patron’s position in it in particular.

Compared with literary tradition, both *kakawin* and *kidung*, it is evident that the marriage practice and the way of transferring kingship in the Majapahit dynasty around 1385 were remarkably different. The Sutasoma *kakawin* explicitly stipulates matrilateral cross-cousin marriage between patrilineal royal lineages, while *kidung* literature places emphasis on patrilateral parallel-cousin marriage. Actual practice in the Majapahit dynasty, on the other hand, does not indicate a clear preference for either pattern, although there is a tendency to prefer cross-cousin marriage, either patrilateral or matrilateral. King Rājasanagara’s first wife Sudewi, as already discussed, might have been regarded as his matrilateral parallel-cousin (mother’s sister’s daughter). But those in the younger generation Wikramawardhana and Wirabhumi, and probably Raṇamanggala, were married to their cross-cousins. These cases of cross-cousin marriage are worth paying further attention to, for, as we shall later see, the relation between them appears to have been of great importance for Tantular’s composition of the Sutasoma *kakawin*.

Wikramawardhana, Wirabhumi and Raṇamanggala were cousins in the first place, for the latter two were directly or indirectly Wikramawardhana’s matrilateral cross-cousins (mother’s brother’s son). Then, Raṇamanggala and Wirabhumi took Wikramawardhana’s full-sisters as wives. Unlike the Sutasoma narrative, in which there is a clear distinction between two patrilineal “wife-giving” and “wife-taking” groups, the pattern which appears here can be described as the exchange of women between Wikramawardhana and Wirabhumi. However, they did not belong to a distinct patrilineal lineage as in the Sutasoma but to a sort of extended kin group based on a bilateral descent system. This is more evident in the transmission of kingship. While in the Sutasoma kingship is transmitted strictly along the patrilineal lineage, in
the Majapahit dynasty kingship was transmitted from Rājasanagara to his sister’s son Wikramawardhana, then from Wikramawardhana to his daughter Suhițā.

Another remarkable feature of the kin relationships of the Majapahit royal family is found in the the residential pattern of the royal members in the palace. According to Pigeaud, the description in the Nāgarakṛṭāgama (cantos 8–12) indicates that the palace in Majapahit palace was not a single building but consisted of several compounds, not unlike present kraton in the central Java (Pigeaud 1960–63). A compound where members of the royal family resided was called pura, whereas a compound where ministers and clergy lived was called kuwu. What makes the Majapahit palace unique is that there were two royal compounds on the palace site, one in west and the other in east. As Pigeaud says, “Majapahit contained two main compounds . . . Of the two compounds the western, the Royal compound, was inhabited by the family of Majapahit–Singasari–Jiwana [Kahuripan], to which King Hayam Wuruk belonged; the eastern compound was residence of the family of Wêngkêr–Daha” (Pigeaud 1960–63: vol 4, 27). This means that those who lived in the western compound were the king Rājasanagara and his consorts and children, Rājasanagara’s father Kṛtawardhana and mother Tribhuwana, and Rājasanagara’s younger sister Iśwari and her consort and children. In the eastern compound, on the other hand, there lived Wijayarājasa and his consort Rājadewi, and Wijayarājasa’s daughter Indudewi and her consort Rājasawardhana.

Evidently the distribution of the royal family over the two compounds must have been based on the understanding that Tribhuwana and Rājadewi had equal claims to the throne, in particular after the death in 1328 of Kṛtarājasa’s only son Jayanagara in 1328, who died without issue. Both were not only daughters of the first monarch Kṛtarājasa’s daughters but also born from Rājapatni, the daughter of the last Singasari king Kṛtanagara. Thus, those who belonged to Tribhuwana’s lineage lived on the western compound, whereas those who belonged to Rājadewi’s lived on the eastern compound. This sort of residential arrangement must have been regarded as legitimate, for it was completely in accordance with the Austronesian bilateral kinship system and
also with the ancient Javanese notion of the female consort as the container of royal šakti. When Jayanagara died in 1328 Tribhuwanā assumed the throne until Rājapati’s death in 1350. It was then that Rājasanagara succeeded to the throne.

The Nāgarakṛtāgama also informs us that political responsibility was shared between the two royal compounds and was primarily shouldered by the senior male member of the respective compound. The political importance of the eastern compound was no less than that of the western compound, where the king Rājasanagara resided. In particular the prominence of Wijayarājasa, the senior male of the eastern compound, in the Majapahit court is apparent in the Nāgarakṛtāgama. His name is mentioned alongside that of Kṛtawardhana as one of the two “fathers” (rāma) of the king Rājasanagara (58.3, 71.2). He had a key position in the Majapahit administration, for he is described as “being well-informed of peasant holdings; organizing the compilation of descriptions of the districts that were under royal authority; and stimulating the upkeep of roads, public buildings, and temples” (Hall 1985: 343).

His influence must have further increased after the death of the domineering Gajah Mada in 1364. The Chinese chronicle Ming-shih (History of the Ming, book 324) records that in 1377 the king of Java called Pa-ta-na-pa-na-wu sent tributary envoys to the Chinese imperial court (Colless 1975: 487). The king’s name has been restored as Bhatāra Prabhu, which simply means “king”, hence referring to the king at the time, Rājasangara, who reigned from 1350 to 1389. The chronicle also states that in Java there was a king in the west and another king in the east. The western king was called Wu-lao-po-wu, which was restored as Bhra Prabhu, another designation for king, while the name of the eastern king Wu-yüan-lao-wang-chieh was restored by Coedès and Colles independently as Bhre Wêngkêr, the title of Wijayarājasa (Coedès 1968: 240; Colles 1975: 487–9). This information indicates that Wijayarājasa not only had a high-profile in domestic administration but also maintained at some stage independent diplomatic relations with China.

The mention of the eastern and western kings in the Chinese record have lead several scholars to the conclusion that during the reign of Rājasanagara the territory of
Majapahit was divided into the eastern and western kingdoms. However, considering the arrangement of the Majapahit palace described in the Nāgarakṛtāgama, it appears more likely that the Chinese record reflects not the territorial division of the kingdom but the political division between the two royal compounds in the palace. In any case, it is plausible that, even around 1385 when the Sutasoma was composed, the tension between the two royal compounds over political power was increasingly felt by the courtiers. Not long after 1385, the tension eventually culminated in the civil war of 1404–1406 between the then monarch Wikramawardhana (Hyang Wišeṣa) and Wirabhūmi. According to Noorduyn (1975), upon the death of Rājadewī (Bhre Daha) around 1372, her daughter Indudewi succeeded to the title of Bhre Daha, and then, being childless, adopted Wirabhūmi as son. Thus, it stands to reason that Wirabhūmi, after that time, resided in the eastern compound.

The tension between the two royal compounds must have been accelerated by the change of generation, as Rājasanagara died in 1389 and Wijayarājasa in 1398. Probably triggered by the death of Wikramawardhana’s only son from his first wife

26 It was Krom who, drawing on the Chinese record, first advanced the hypothesis of the territorial division of Majapahit kingdom into the eastern and western ones (1931: 425). The hypothesis has been since accepted by standard textbooks on Indonesian history, such as Hall (1981). The hypothesis, however, is based on the identification of the eastern king’s name Wu-yün-lao-wang-chiew with Wirabhūmi, which is, as Krom himself admits, merely a conjecture. Krom, then, attributes the division to the king Rājasanagara’s desire to protect the rights of Wirabhūmi, the son from a concubine, by making him the king of the eastern half of the kingdom. Apparently Krom was influenced by Airlangga’s division of his kingdom in the eleventh century, who, according to the Nāgarakṛtāgama (68.1), did so because of his love towards his two sons. However, since the eastern king’s name has been established as referring to Wijayarājasa (Bhre Wēngkēr), the evidence for the division seems to be weak. Moreover, the existence of the two royal compounds in the Majapahit palace more readily explains the appearance of the two kings in the Chinese record. Since the problem of the territorial division does not directly affect our discussion on the kin relationships and marriage practices in the Majapahit kingdom, I shall refrain from detailed analysis of Chinese and Javanese records, but the reader is advised to refer to my separate article on the issue (Aoyama 1992).
Kusumawardhāni in 1399, Wirabhūmi, now the head of the eastern compound, openly challenged the claim to the throne of Wikramawardhana in the western compound. According to the Ming-shih, in 1403 the western king of Java Tu-ma-pan, reconstructed as Tumapel, an ancient name of Java known to Chinese, sent an envoy to China, whom the Chinese emperor greeted by granting a gold-plated silver seal. Then the eastern king of Java Bo-ling-da-ha, reconstructed as Bhreng Daha, that is Indudewi, or Putreng Daha, that is Wirabhūmi, sent an envoy to the Chinese court and asked a seal from him, which the emperor granted. The request of the Chinese seal, which was customarily given by a Chinese emperor to his vassals as a token of his recognition of the vassal’s local sovereignty, is an unambiguous sign of the challenge to the throne. The ensuing battle of 1404–1406, however, ended in the death of Wirabhūmi, thus putting an end to the political division between the two royal compounds in Majapahit.

From the Arjunawijaya to the Sutasoma

The foregoing analysis inevitably gives us the impression that the marriage practices described in the Sutasoma narrative may have been regarded as somewhat anachronistic by the contemporary audience. The narrative not merely describes but consciously advocates matrilateral cross-cousin marriage, alliances based on this marital relationship, and the transmission of kingship along the patrilineal lineage. This pattern appears not to accord with actual practices observable in two fields, social and political, at the time. On the one hand, the marriage practices of the Majapahit dynasty, based on the Austronesian bilateral system, was far looser than the one described in the Sutasoma narrative. It appears that the Majapahit royal family favoured cousin marriage in general and the transmission of kingship along the female line, either by affinity or by consanguinity. On the other hand, some early narratives of kidung literature, the new literary genre which began to emerge around the time when the Sutasoma was composed, demonstrates a preference for mainly patrilateral parallel-cousin marriage, while the theme of the alliance through the marital relationship is as
clear as it is in the case of the Sutasoma narrative. The origin of the pattern described
in the kidung narratives is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, if what we know
of present Balinese society, in which patrilateral cross-cousin marriage is preferred
(Geertz and Geertz 1975: 55), serves as some indication, the kidung narratives may
reflect a social practice peculiar to the Balinese society. In any case the fact remains
that it was plainly evident to the reader in the late fourteenth century Javanese society
that the marriage practices described in the Sutasoma narrative did not reflect either the
reality of the Majapahit court or the possible emergence of the new pattern.

Needless to say, the marriage practices described in the Sutasoma narrative are
not unique to this narrative, but are conventions which originated in the Indian
Mahābhārata cycle and subsequently adopted by kakawin literature. The Sutasoma
narrative is, in the first place, a kakawin work and thus there is no reason why
Tantular should not have accepted the conventions as such, just as he set the story
space in India. But, then, the Sutasoma at the same time demonstrates a degree of
originality. The story time is set in the kaliyuga and the hero is identified as the
reincarnation of Buddha, points which constitute a radical departure from the kakawin
tradition. More importantly the story itself is not directly related to or derivative of the
Indian epic cycles but is for the most part Tantular’s own creation. Therefore, if
Tantular had wished to describe marriage practices in a different way, he could have
done so, as the kidung Sudamala and Sri Tañjung did in the case of the marriage of
Sakula and Sadewa, or at least Tantular could have elected to put less emphasis on the
matter, as he himself did in the Arjunawijaya.

It is plausible, then, to suggest that the conspicuous position of marriage
practices in the narrative was a signal from Tantular, intended to invite the
contemporary reader to see it as his comment on contemporary society. This
proposition is not at all unlikely, in particular if we remember Tantular’s skilful,
sometimes playful, handling of various narrative elements, such as the Javanization of
the setting and the embedding of Tantric Buddhism in the narrative. In fact, these
elements must have made more sense, if the reader was allowed to situate them in a
social context which he knew well. In this connection, it seems sensible to regard Tantular's two works, the Arjunawijaya and Sutasoma, as a literary series which took place in a certain socio-historical context, thus enabling the clarification of the significance of the shift of theme between the two works.

As mentioned earlier, the Arjunawijaya narrative involves several themes whose primary concern is the legitimation of kingship. They include a battle over the throne between brothers, the sexual intimacy between the king and his female consort, the king's display of abundant generosity towards his subjects and the endorsement of royal authority by priestly authority. It has been pointed out that all these themes are related one way or another to the social context (Worsley 1991). However, it is the last one that has drawn the attention of scholars who have attempted to establish a link between narrative elements and a specific social event or situation, a link which may also have enabled the contemporary reader to situate the narrative in the socio-historical context.

The part of the narrative which has become the focal point in this connection is the one which describes the king Arjuna Sahasrabâhu's visit to a Saiwa-Buddhist religious complex (dharma) (25.5–31.5). There the king holds a conversation with a temple priest, in which the latter explicates the Buddhist statues housed in the Buddhist caṇḍi, and then proclaims king's duty of liberality (dāna) towards his subjects as of the highest merit. This second point appears to be a matter of great interest to the priest, for in the end he has this to tell the king:

30.1 ... / do not only build a new temple-complexes, but maintain existing ones as well; / make every effort to ensure that the common people do not intrude, so that the priest may prosper.

Then, after specifying what is to be given to the Buddhists, Śiwaites and ṛṣi, the priest reiterates the importance of this particular royal duty, saying that:

27 We have discussed the Buddhist pantheon in chapter four.
30.2 ... it is indeed forbidden for you [the king Arjuna Sahasrabāhu] to make a mistake in this respect; even if you are powerful, be careful Your Majesty, for if you do, you will surely fall into distress.

30.3 If you do nothing about this, misery will result; it will harm the whole world, and people will be reduced to moaning and sighing in the open space; it would be we horrible as if the demon Kāla engulfed and overwhelmed them ...

Evidently, the severity of the consequence of negligence makes this statement more than a piece of friendly advice. It is a warning that the king do his utmost to support and maintain priestly institutions, such as the one mentioned here. Accordingly, it is related in the narrative that, when later the king comes across a collapsed Hindu temple, he promptly orders the soldiers and officers to restore it to the past glory and throughout the rest of his journey, he devotes himself to the restoration of ruined religious complexes (32.2-4).

Supomo has suggested that the Śaiwa-Buddhist religious complex mentioned above refers to Kagēnēngan, one of the most important religious complexes mentioned in the Nāgarakṛtāgama (36.1–37.6), on the ground that both complexes are comprised of two cañḍi, one Buddhist and the other Śiwaite (Supomo 18977: 64–5). In the Nāgarakṛtāgama, the king Rājasanagara's visit to the Kagēnēngan complex, the burial place of the founder of the Singasari dynasty Rājasa, occasions Prapañca's lament about the decaying condition of the Buddhist cañḍi and his appeal to Rājasangara for its restoration.28 According to Supomo, Prapañca's appeal was successful, for when later Tantular wrote the Arjunawijaya, he could describe the same Buddhist cañḍi as peerless (aparimita, 26.4). Thus, the priest's discourse to Arjuna

28 Supomo mistakenly describes the dharma as the burial place of "the founder of the Majapahit dynasty", that is, Kṛtarājasa (1977: 64). But the Nāgarakṛtāgama (40.5) clearly states that it is for Rājasa, the founder of the Singasari dynasty.
Sahasrabāhu in the Arjunawijaya is in reality Tantular’s endorsement of the king Rājasanagara’s restoration of the Kagēnēngan complex and, at the same time, an appeal to the king to continue to maintain of priestly institutions.

Worsley, on the other hand, has advanced an alternative hypothesis that the temple complex in the Arjunawijaya is an allusion to a similar religious complex mentioned in the Bungur inscription of 1367 (1991: 184–5). The inscription records that the king Rājasanagara granted a certain dyah Parih a request for the renewal of the ancient right of the Bungur complex as a tax-exempt domain. The grant may have become possible because of the intervention of Rājasawardhani and Raṇamanggala on behalf of Parih, for in the inscription Parih is said to be loyal in the service of these two royal persons. Since Raṇamanggala was the patron of Tantular, it seems probable then that Tantular knew the event and decided to make an allusion to it in the Arjunawijaya in praise of the role of Raṇamanggala.

In any case, what is important for the present discussion is not so much to know what is the correct identification of the religious complex in the Arjunawijaya or even whether it is an allusion at all, as it is to understand the social situation these data appear to refer to. In fact, it may not be mere coincidence that these priestly appeals to the king began to appear within a decade or so after the death of Gajah Mada in 1364, whose career was devoted to a series of military campaigns to suppress rebellions and to expand the influence of the kingdom. Thus, Supomo asserts that, “with so many wars having been fought by various contending powers before the whole country was brought into a fragile unified structure under the hegemony of Majapahit, such temple complexes remains must have been a familiar sight in Tantular’s days” (1976: 66).29 What is at issue, however, is not only the restoration of ruined religious complexes but also the material well-being of religious institutions in general and the recognition of

29 Apart from the Arjunawijaya, Tantular also presents a similar description of a ruined Hindu temple in the Sutasoma narrative, which Sutasoma comes across on his journey to Mount Meru (13.1–2).
priestly authority in the matter of the legitimation of kingship. Then, it would not be unlikely, as Worsley has suggested that what we see here is precisely the situation following the death of Gajah Mada, in which the poets, who themselves belonged to the priestly class, took advantage of the event to rectify their neglected condition during the militaristic period of Gajah Mada.

If the Arjunawijaya narrative can be said to be Tantular's comment on the post-Gajah Mada situation, the Sutasoma narrative is his comment on the pre-civil war situation. As discussed above, when the Sutasoma *kakawin* was composed around 1385, tension between the eastern and western royal compounds must have been discernable. It appears that thematic shift from the Arjunawijaya to the Sutasoma narrative reflects this new political climate in the Majapahit kingdom. The advocacy by Sutasoma of a non-violent solution based on Buddhist principles, instead of a violent one based on *kṣatriya* principles, must have been welcomed by the court audience as the more desirable option to solve the inter-dynastic conflict. Although there is no conclusive proof that either king Rājasanagara or Wijayarājasa was a Buddhist, the identification made in the Sutasoma narrative of Rājasanagara as the future incarnation of Buddhā-King. Although Tantular evidently believed in the superiority of Buddhism over Śiwaism, the repeated assertion of the oneness of the goals of Buddhism and Śiwaism may have made this identification possible.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that among the members of royal family who belonged to the generation which was one generation younger than Rājasangara's, there is an instance that resembles a marriage pattern described in the Sutasoma narrative. The generation included Wikramawardhana, who resided in the western royal compound and was to succeed Rājasanagara as king in 1389, Wirabhūmi, who had been adopted by Indudewi and since then resided in the eastern

---

30 Rājasanagara is called among others Janeśwara in the Pararaton (Brandes 1920). This may indicate that his religious orientation was Śiwaism.
royal compound, and Rañamanggala, the patron of Tantular. The three men were closely connected to one another. Firstly, Wikramawardhana was married to Kusumawardhani, his matrilateral cross-cousin (mother’s brother’s daughter) and probably, in people’s perception, Wirabhūmi’s sister. Wirabhūmi, on the other hand, was married to Nāgarawardhani, his patrilateral cross-cousin (father’s sister’s daughter) and Wikramawardhana’s sister. Finally, Rañamanggala’s consort was Rājasawardhani, who was Wikramawardhana’s other sister and, as discussed above, may have been regarded as Rañamanggala’s patrilateral cross-cousin (father’s sister’s daughter).

Among these royal couples it is only the marriage between Wikramawardhana and Kusumawardhani that is a matrilateral cross-cousin marriage, the predominant marriage pattern in the Sutasoma narrative. However, in the Sutasoma narrative the matrilateral cross-cousin marriage between Sutasoma and Candrawati may be in reality a result of another simple yet decisive principle, as Daśabāhu’s pledge clearly demonstrates (64.4): give one’s sister as wife to the man to whom one will owe allegiance. According to this principle, Daśabāhu marries off Candrawati to Sutasoma and subsequently pledges his loyalty to Sutasoma as the commander-in-chief of the kingdom of Hastina. The implication of Daśabāhu’s strategy must have been obvious to the contemporary reader in the Majapahit court. Wikramawardhana’s two sisters were married to Wirabhūmi and Rañamanggala, and Wikramawardhana’s consort Kusumawardhani, in turn, was probably regarded as Wirabhūmi’s sister. According to the Sutasoma narrative, this could be translated to mean that Wikramawardhana was to serve Wirabhūmi and Rañamanggala, whereas Wirabhūmi was to serve

---

31 The Pararaton does not give a date for Wirabhūmi’s adoption. But the fact that the adoption is recorded between events in 1357 and 1362 in the Pararaton (Brandes 1920: 37), and that the Nāgarakṛtāgama does not mention Wirabhūmi’s name among major royal personages (cantos 2-7), suggests that we may assume that when the Nāgarakṛtāgama was completed in 1365 he had been already adopted by Rājasawardhana and Indudewi, and was not counted as Rājasanagara’s son any more.
Wikramawardhana. Therefore, a reading of the Sutasoma narrative might have suggested to the reader that marriage commanded alliance between their kinsmen.

Even when a narrative may be read allegorically, it need not be a coherent representation of the reality throughout its recounting of the story. In fact, unlike Daśabāhu, Wikramawardhana would not be expected to assume a subordinate position to the receivers of his sisters. Furthermore, in the Majapahit court the relationship was not that of a one-way giving of sisters, but rather that of exchanging sisters. The social function of a narrative, therefore, is better defined as providing a verbal model through which the audience may perceive and understand reality. It is plausible, then, to assume that, with an expectation of growing tension between the eastern and western royal compounds, the tension was undoubtedly expected to intensify in the event of the death of king Rājasonagara. Daśabāhu’s strategy then might have been regarded by the contemporary audience as the most appropriate advice, advice which urged the royal members to consolidate their alliance on the grounds that they had one another’s sisters as wives. Sutasoma’s insistence on a non-violent solution to confrontation, too, must have been regarded as a preferable option, whether it was based on Buddhism or not, to overcome intra-dynastic conflict. It is in this respect that the Sutasoma narrative can be said to be a comment on the contemporary social situation. It was addressed to the royal family not only by Tantular but ultimately also by his royal patron Raṇamanggala, for as consort of Wikramawardhana’s sister, he had much to gain from the dissemination of the Sutasoma narrative in the Majapahit literary scene.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION: RECEPTION OF THE NARRATIVE TEXT

Like Sutasoma’s long and adventurous journey through the forests, mountains and foreign kingdoms, we too have traversed the whole world of the Sutasoma story represented in a narrative text. During this endeavour we have not only witnessed a series of events which the hero experiences and observed the spatio-temporal setting in which these events take place, but also visited other represented worlds which are intertextually connected to the world of the Sutasoma story and glimpsed the socio-historical conditions in which the author Tantular and the audience lived. In this imaginary journey it has been the concept of reception that served us as our guide leading us through the complexity of the narrative. True to the spirit of this concept, then, what has been finally gained also may be left to each reader to decide. However, by way of concluding the study, in the following I shall suggest a reconstruction of the horizon of expectation of the Sutasoma narrative in the hope of presenting my own understanding of the process of reception of this narrative text in ancient Javanese society.

As we have discussed in chapter one, Jauss suggests that there are three factors which constitute the horizon of expectation, that is, genre, intertextuality and social function. Firstly, we shall look into the aspect of genre. When the Sutasoma narrative appeared around 1385, the simple fact that the narrative was composed in kakawin form, as opposed to parwa or kidung, predetermined the reception of the work.¹ First of all, to be a kakawin the text had to be written in Old Javanese, adorned with embellishments of sound and meaning, and versified in accordance with metric rules of Indian origin. In the first or last stanzas the author–narrator usually introduced

¹ In stanza 148.1 the narrative refers to itself as a kakawin.
himself and gave a benediction and a salutation. The story, on the other hand, had to recount an aristocratic hero’s deeds, allegedly based on historical incidents, including such episodes as a journey, romance and battle. By depicting these deeds, then, the story exemplifies the fruition of the fourfold ends of life, *artha, kāma, dharma* and *mokṣa*. These conventions had been established in ancient Javanese literature since the Rāmāyaṇa, the oldest *kakawin* known to us, and obeyed by subsequent *kakawin* works. Therefore, it was natural for the audience to anticipate that the Sutasoma *kakawin*, the latest in the series of *kakawin*, also fulfilled such conventions. In fact the Sutasoma *kakawin* is conservative in this regard, for its composition adhered perfectly to the generic conventions described above.

However, what must have made the Sutasoma *kakawin* appear different in the perception of the audience from preceding *kakawin* narratives was its treatment of the represented world in relation to other *kakawin* narratives. Prior to the *kakawin* Sutasoma, the represented world of *kakawin* narratives was customarily set spatially in India and temporally in the first three of the four *yuga* ages. More importantly, this particular setting enabled events and characters in the narrative to be taken from the Indian epic cycles, which had become part of the literary knowledge of ancient Javanese society. In other words, *kakawin* narratives recounted the epic past, a past which was inaccessible from the narrational present because of the epic distance between the two times. Nevertheless *kakawin* narratives were relevant to the Javanese audience because they recounted the national past. The Sutasoma *kakawin* broke away from this convention because of its temporal setting in the *kaliyuga*, the last of the four *yuga* ages, in which we now live. Even its spatial setting, which was ostensibly set in India, was “localized” to such an extent that it would have been possible for the audience to project the landscape and geography of Java onto the spatial setting of the narrative. The use of a new spatio-temporal setting, then, enabled the author to tell of events and characters which were not directly related with the Indian epic cycles but were mostly the invention of the author. The introduction of Buddhist ideology into a *kakawin* as the main theme was possible through this process.
Needless to say, the Sutasoma *kakawin* is not the first *kakawin* to deviate from the generic conventions. Already in 1365 for the first time in the history of *kakawin* literature, Prapāṇca described contemporary Javanese society in his *kakawin*, the Nāgarakṛtāgama. It appears that this move was considered to be too radical by Javanese society, for there has been no poet after Prapāṇca who attempted to follow in this direction. Compared with the Nāgarakṛtāgama, the Sutasoma was not as radical. The temporal setting is set in the kaliyuga, but the spatial setting is still in India, albeit significantly “localized”. The events and characters are not taken from the Indian epic cycles, but a genealogical link between the characters and the epic cycles is maintained. Nevertheless, because of its deviation from the generic conventions, the Sutasoma narrative must have impressed the audience, who were already acquainted with Tantular’s previous and more conventional *kakawin* work the Arjunawijaya. Since the Arjunawijaya and Sutasoma narratives constituted a sort of literary series, as works by the same author, when the new work appeared, the audience would have naturally compared it with the old one. It would have been immediately obvious to the audience that while the *kakawin* Arjunawijaya, which recounts a story taken from the Indian epic cycle, was composed entirely within the framework of the generic convention, the Sutasoma *kakawin* was not.

The shift from the Arjunawijaya to the Sutasoma as well as the composition of the Nāgarakṛtāgama apparently point to a desire emerging in the late fourteenth century among *kakawin* authors to accommodate their works with a new literary horizon of expectation in Javanese society, although the way to achieve this was not yet formulated. For instance, to set the story time in the kaliyuga, as in the Sutasoma, certainly must have encouraged the audience to interpret the story in terms of their own experience. The Nāgarakṛtāgama opted for directly recounting the contemporary situation of Javanese society without any pretense of talking about India. Despite these efforts, however, the *kakawin* form was eventually abandoned as the principal genre of literary works which could meaningfully talk about the contemporary life of Javanese society. Now *kidung* literature which was written in Middle Javanese,
versified in accordance with indigenous metric rules and more significantly set its story in Javanese courts in the past, subsequently became dominant in the literary scene. The dominance of kidung literature is probably because it succeeded by keeping a subtle balance of bringing the story time close enough to the contemporary world to be relevant to the audience and yet maintaining epic distance so that the story world could be perceived as taking place in a kind of epic past. This is not to deny the fact that kakawin literature remained a source of literary inspiration for generations more, and that in particular in Balinese society, kakawin literature has been not only considered to be contemporaneous with kidung but has also been created until the present time. Yet it is also undeniable that since the fifteenth century no kakawin work of major literary significance has been created.

Intertextuality, the second aspect of the horizon of expectation, is another textual element which enabled the audience to situate themselves in relation to the text. Some intertextual references in the Sutasoma narrative are explicit in the sense that the very process of intertextual reference is marked by the mention of a particular episode or character in another text. In many cases the function of explicit intertextual references is to situate the narrative in the kakawin genre by linking the narrative with other kakawin or parwa texts as a frame of reference. For instance, Yudhiṣṭhira, the eldest of the Pândava brothers in the Mahābhārata cycle, is mentioned by Sutasoma’s father and Sumitra as the ideal ksatriya king, who seeks mokṣa only after accomplishing his obligations as a ksatriya (4.1, 24.6). It must be pointed out that in the Sutasoma narrative a reference to a kakawin text is not treated as the ultimate authority which the reader must accept unconditionally. On the contrary, its credibility is constrained by two factors; the reliability of the focalizer who makes the reference and the reception of the reference by other characters, in particular Sutasoma. As for the reference to Yudhiṣṭhira, it is made by the characters who represent the principle of the world maintainer, whereas Sutasoma, who adheres to that of the world renouncer, refutes the relevance of the reference. In the end the contradiction turns out to be groundless, as Tantular advances the concept of the Buddha–King based on Tantric
Buddhism, which transcends the difference of the two positions. Thus, one of the important effects of intertextuality is to create a "polyphonic" discourse in the narrative, allowing the reader to consider more than one interpretation on a topic.\footnote{The Sutasoma narrative gives us a concrete clue as to which \textit{kakawin} works constituted the literary horizon of expectation at that time. Apart from the Mahābhārata cycle, the works explicitly referred to in the narrative are: the Rāmāyaṇa (44.3, 90.10, 130.12), Arjunawiwaha (43.3, 147.7), Sumanasantaka (63.1), Bhomāntaka (132.4) and Arjunawijaya, Tantular's own work (44.3)}

In addition to the reference to \textit{kakawin} texts, the introduction of Buddhist ideology into a \textit{kakawin} text presupposes the existence of intertextual references to Buddhist texts within the horizon of expectation. In the first place, the name of the hero Sutasoma and the germinal episode of the origin of the man-eater and his pacification by Sutasoma, as well as the episodes of Sutasoma's encounter with a tigress were taken from Buddhist \textit{jātaka} literature. More significantly, the first half of the Sutasoma story, from Sutasoma's birth to his enlightenment, was clearly modelled on the life story of the Buddha. The two \textit{mandala} configurations, on the other hand, reflect Yoga Tantra and Anuttarayoga Tantra, the highest two stages of Tantric Buddhism. It is difficult, however, to determine the exact textual origin of the Buddhist elements, for there are few Buddhist texts, either narrative or non-narrative, in Old Javanese which are known to us. We can only conclude that the life story of the Buddha and \textit{jātaka} literature must have been part of the horizon of expectation, considering the fact that they are depicted on the reliefs of Cāndi Borobudur. As for Tantric Buddhism, the similarity of phrasing to the Sang Hyang Kamahāyānīkan and the appearance of the similar fivefold pantheon in the Arjunawijaya and Kuñjarakarṇa suggest that certain Tantric Buddhist elements in the Sutasoma narrative were undoubtedly incorporated in the horizon of expectation.

In this connection, there is a noteworthy passage in the Sutasoma \textit{kakawin} which indicates the contemporary perception of Tantric Buddhism. Towards the end of the narrative, the battle breaks out between the armies of the demons and the kingdom
of Hastina. The battle is temporarily halted at nightfall. Then the narrative switches to a
description of the horrifying scene of the battlefield (125.5–11). Interestingly,
however, the battlefield resembles, presumably through the focalization of an initiated
person, an ascetic’s hermitage in a remote mountain. Piles of corpses look like
mountains, banners left in the field like trees, heaps of cut-off heads like rocks, and
layers of corpses like the steps to the hermitage. In the midst of the field a Mahayana
Buddhist ascetic appears and meditate to invoke god Heruka to descend. At this point
the author–narrator makes a comment that the ascetic’s desire is not to devour human
flesh or to satisfy himself with food and drink, but only to gain true knowledge, the
power over death and life. This comment suggests that the perception of Tantric
Buddhist ritual as a hideous act was such a common one that Tantular felt obliged to
correct what he thought to be a misconception.

In any case, what is remarkable about Tantular is his ambition and ability to
weave contrasting discourses, the one Buddhist and the other Hindu, into a single
dialogic narrative discourse. Thus, not only the life story of the Buddha but also the
episode of Arjuna’s asceticism are projected upon a series of episodes from
Sutasoma’s miraculous birth, through his escape from the palace, journey to Mount
Meru and finally his enlightenment on the top of the mountain. Furthermore, the
Buddhist way of release (adwayayoga) and Siwaite way of release (sadangayoga) are
juxtaposed as two possible options in Sutasoma’s religious discourse to the three
disciples. Finally, the hero’s neutralization of a demon, who upsets cosmic order, is a
common theme in kakawin works connected with the Indian epic cycles since the
Râmâyana kakawin. In the Sutasoma narrative, however, the final solution is not the
destruction of the demon by force but his pacification by the power of Buddhist
compassion. In this way, while Buddhist and Hindu discourses are contrasted as the
story evolves along the trajectory of the hero Sutasoma, the superiority of the former
over the latter is clearly demonstrated. Therefore, despite Zoetmulder’s evaluation of
the Sutasoma kakawin as “long-drawn-out story, or rather collection of stories”,
poorly constructed and unbalanced in its composition (1974: 346–7), we must note
that the creation of a coherent chronotope (Platonic time) in the narrative by the merging of different discourses present in the horizon of expectation is Tantular’s single most significant literary achievement.

Finally, we shall examine the question of social function, the third aspect of the horizon of expectation. In the reception of the text by the contemporary audience the aspect of social function was most noticeable in a thematic shift between the Arjunawijaya and the Sutasoma *kakawin*. Although the story of the Arjunawijaya, taken from the Indian epic cycle, conforms to the generic conventions of *kakawin* literature, the ending of the story is uncomfortably inconclusive. The hero king Arjuna Sahasrabahu not only predicts his own death at the hands of the priestly incarnation of Viṣṇu but also at a priest’s request agrees to release the demon king Rāvana, whom he has just managed to capture. The episode indicates that kingly authority, which is legitimized by priestly authority in the first place, has to submit itself to priestly authority and that the *kṣatriya* principle itself is in the end ineffectual in restoring social and cosmic order. In the Arjunawijaya *kakawin*, thus, Tantular raised the question of a kingship which is truly legitimate and at the same time effectual, but stopped short of giving an answer to it. The *kakawin* Sutasoma, then, might have been expected by the audience to be an attempt to answer the question. Tantular’s answer in the Sutasoma is in fact twofold. Firstly, the opposition between kingly authority and priestly authority, or the principle of world maintainer and that of world renouncer, is resolved on the grounds of Tantric Buddhism, in which the two principles are combined in the hero Sutasoma as Buddha–King, who is capable of restoring social and cosmic order by the non-violent means of Buddhist compassion. Secondly, matrilateral cross-cousin marriage between patrilineal lineages is suggested as an ideal marriage pattern, and one which consolidates kin relationships allowing the formation of an alliance greater than a single lineage.

Of course, it is only when the audience could see relevant references to the socio-historical reality in the narrative that the narrative could be read by the audience as the author’s comments on social conditions. When the Arjunawijaya was
composed, the memory of the era of Gajah Mada, who died only about a decade before the composition of the *kakawin*, had not faded away from the audience. Gajah Mada's era was characterized by incessant campaigns to suppress rebellions and to expand the political influence of Majapahit. It is not difficult to imagine that as a result there were grievances on the part of the priesthood, to which Tantular himself belonged, because of the neglect of the maintenance of religious complexes in particular and the decline of the well-being of religious institutions in general. Against this background, Tantular's *Arjunawijaya* would appear to be a priestly manifesto which demanded that priestly authority be reinstated over kingly authority and neglect of religious institutions be corrected. The record in the *Nâgarakrtâgama* of king Râjasanagara's activity concerning religious institutions indicates that this priestly appeal was not taken lightly by the members of the royal family of Majapahit. In this context, Rânamanggala, Tantular's royal patron, who did contribute toward securing the material interests of a religious institution, certainly would have anticipated that the *kakawin* *Arjunawijaya* was perceived by the royal audience as a literary endorsement of his own action.

When the Sutasoma *kakawin* was composed around 1385, social conditions had greatly changed since the composition of the *Arjunawijaya* *kakawin* about a decade before. The issue now was the escalating tension over power between the western and eastern royal compound in the capital of Majapahit, represented by the king Râjasanagara and Wijayarâjasa respectively. Although Wijayarâjasa acknowledged Râjasanagara's sovereignty, his political prominence in the eastern compound was of such significance that the Chinese recorded him as the "eastern" king of Java. The tension, after the passing of the older generation and the emergence of a new one, eventually lead to the civil war in 1406, resulting in the destruction of the eastern compound by the king Wikramawardhana. To the audience of the Sutasoma *kakawin*, the identification in the narrative of the contemporary Javanese king as the future incarnation of Sutasoma was a clear indication that the narrative could be read, at least in part, as an allegory. Then it would seem to the audience that the concept of Buddha–
King was not merely religious speculation but an alternative model of a king who could maintain social order without resorting to force and that alliances based on a certain pattern of kin relationship was not merely part of the generic convention of *kakawin* literature but a possible way to consolidate relationship within the Majapahit dynasty. Whether these suggestions were accepted by the audience is another matter. History tells us the suggestions in fact were not successful in averting the confrontation. But by bringing the Sutasoma narrative into existence, Tantular and his patron Ranamanggala, at least, made their point of view known to society.

I shall conclude by touching upon another aspect of the horizon of expectation which has not been fully dealt with, namely, diachronic changes in the reception of the Sutasoma narrative. It is a curious fact that in the course of history the reception of the Sutasoma narrative has changed in significantly different ways in Balinese and Javanese societies. In Balinese society, where Hindu and Buddhist elements of ancient Javanese society have been comparatively well preserved, the Sutasoma is still regarded as one of the major *kakawin* works and its story has been often taken up in other art forms, most commonly in *wayang kulit* (Ensink 1974; Hobart 1990; Zurbuchen 1987). The popularity of the Sutasoma there is not so much because of its story-telling as because of its didactic discourse on religious matters, in particular Sutasoma's teachings to the three disciples. In the literary traditions of Javanese society, on the other hand, the story of the prince Sutasoma has been practically forgotten. For instance, when the nineteenth century Surakarta court poet

---

3 Apart from *wayang kulit* a spectacular representation of the Sutasoma story is seen in the paintings on the ceilings of Bale Kambang, built by the Klungkung dynasty in the eighteenth century (Hobart 1990).

4 Bhadra ascribed an increased interest among the Balinese in the Sutasoma story to the spiritual teaching (*tutur*) it contains (1937: 16, 19). However, as Zurbuchen reports, high regard for the spiritual content does not inhibit the Balinese, in particular those less inclined to philosophy, from appreciating the Sutasoma as a story of the adventure and drama of a valiant hero (1987: 89).
Ranggawarsita composed the Pustaka Raja, which was in effect a Javanese way of reordering the whole body of literary knowledge in a chronicle and since then has become an important source book for Javanese wayang stories, the author did not incorporate the Sutasoma story in it (Sri Mulyono 1989: 191–7). More recently, diachronic change of the horizon of expectation has seen a final twist in the context of Indonesian nationalist movement, in which a passage from the kakawin, “bhinneka tunggal ika”, was adopted as a national slogan, referring not to the oneness of the ultimate truth of Siwa and Buddha, but to the “unity in diversity” of the new nation. These instances demonstrate that the horizon of expectation is not fixed and static but dynamic and ever-changing. Although tracing every pivotal stage of the change is beyond the scope of this study, it is certainly an inviting and promising endeavour. This, then, justifiably suggests the possibility of the further application of the horizon of expectation to the study of the history of Javanese literature.
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